

Calendar No. 230

102D CONGRESS
1st Session

SENATE

REPORT
102-154

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1992

SEPTEMBER 20 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 19), 1991.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. INOUE, from the Committee on Appropriations,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 2521]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 2521) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments. Information is herewith presented relative to changes made:

Total of bill as reported to Senate: New obligation authority.....	\$269,713,932,000
Total of 1992 budget estimate	271,356,552,000
Amount of fiscal year 1991 enacted.....	284,181,467,000
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Below fiscal year 1992 budget estimate.....	1,642,620,000
Under enacted appropriations for fiscal year 1991	14,467,535,000

5183-14

CONTENTS

Background:	Page
Purpose of the bill	4
National foreign intelligence budget and related budgets	4
Hearings	5
Summary of bill	5
Budget summit agreement and 602(b) allocation	5
Budget impact of the bill	6

TITLE I—MILITARY PERSONNEL

Military personnel	7
Military personnel, Army	10
Military personnel, Navy	11
Military personnel, Marine Corps	11
Military personnel, Air Force	12
Reserve personnel, Army	14
Reserve personnel, Navy	14
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps	15
Reserve personnel, Air Force	15
National Guard personnel, Army	15
National Guard personnel, Air Force	16

TITLE II—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Operation and maintenance	17
Servicewide operation and maintenance issues and programs	19
Operation and maintenance, Army	41
Operation and maintenance, Navy	47
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	51
Operation and maintenance, Air Force	53
Operation and maintenance, Defense Agencies	64
Operation and maintenance, Army Reserve	74
Operation and maintenance, Navy Reserve	74
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	75
Operation and maintenance, Air Force Reserve	75
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard	76
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard	77
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice	77
Court of Military Appeals	78
Operation and maintenance, World University Games	78
Operation and maintenance, 1996 Summer Olympics	78
Operation and maintenance, real property maintenance	78
Environmental restoration, Defense	81
Humanitarian relief	85

TITLE III—PROCUREMENT

Estimates and appropriation summary	88
Aircraft procurement, Army	103
Missile procurement, Army	107
Procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, Army	112
Procurement of ammunition, Army	117
Other procurement, Army	123
Aircraft procurement, Navy	136
Weapons procurement, Navy	144
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy	150

	Page
Other procurement, Navy	156
Procurement, Marine Corps	171
Aircraft procurement, Air Force	179
Missile procurement, Air Force	187
Other procurement, Air Force	194
Procurement, Defense Agencies	205
National Guard and Reserve equipment	214
Defense Production Act purchases	219

TITLE IV—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

Summary of Committee action	221
Research, development, test and evaluation, Army	232
Research, development, test and evaluation, Navy	257
Research, development, test and evaluation, Air Force	293
Research, development, test and evaluation, Defense Agencies	318
Developmental test and evaluation, Defense	351
Operational test and evaluation, Defense	352

TITLE V—REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

Defense business operations fund [DBOF]	354
---	-----

TITLE VI—OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Chemical agents and munitions destruction, Defense	358
Drug interdiction and counterdrug activities, Defense	360
Inspector general	364

TITLE VII—RELATED AGENCIES

Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system fund	365
Intelligence Community Staff	365
Compliance with paragraph 7, rule 16	367
Compliance with paragraph 12, rule 26	367

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

General provisions	368
--------------------------	-----

BACKGROUND

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to make appropriations for the military functions of the Department of Defense for the period October 1, 1991, through September 30, 1992. Functional areas include the pay, allowances, and support of military personnel, operation and maintenance of the forces, procurement of equipment and systems, and research, development, test and evaluation. Appropriations for military assistance, military construction, family housing, nuclear warheads, and civil defense are provided in other bills.

In its examination of the President's budget for defense appropriations the Committee has made a deliberate effort to review funding requests within the context of the national security objectives they are intended to serve. The Committee believes that presenting requests for defense appropriations or considering individual weapons systems or force structures without reference to the ends they are intended to serve is to rob them of any intelligible meaning. We have, therefore, sought the views of policymakers in the executive branch and outside experts. That defense policy should be considered in such a way was the intent of the National Security Act of 1947, which created what was then known as the National Military Establishment and what came to be known as the Department of Defense.

NATIONAL FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE BUDGET AND RELATED BUDGETS

The Committee has reviewed the National Foreign Intelligence Program budget, the intelligence-related activities budgets, and special access program budgets which are funded in this bill. The results of the Committee's review are made available in a separate classified annex as an integral part of this bill, and further explained in a classified report accompanying the bill. The intelligence community and the Department of Defense are expected to comply fully with the provisions of the classified annex, and the recommendations and directives in its accompanying report.

The Committee is aware of past instances in which components and program offices of the Department of Defense responsible for conducting specific special access programs have not received timely and complete notification of the recommendations and directives contained in the classified annexes for annual appropriations measures. This situation has resulted in actions contrary to Committee guidance.

It is the responsibility of the Directorate for Special Programs and the Comptroller within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and of the appropriate budget and comptroller organizations for each of the armed services, to ensure proper notification of Com-

mittee actions affecting special access programs. It also is the responsibility of each program manager to ensure he or she is fully cognizant—through the above-mentioned liaison channels—of Committee actions affecting his or her specific program, project, or activity.

HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations began hearings on the fiscal year 1992 budget request on March 4, 1991, and concluded them on May, 23, 1991, after 19 separate sessions. The subcommittee heard testimony from representatives of the Department of Defense, other Federal agencies, and from the general public. Approximately 1,714 pages of transcript were taken, the unclassified portions of which constitute the five-volume public record of testimony on this budget request.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The Committee considered a total fiscal year 1991 budget request of \$271,365,552,000 in new obligational authority for the military functions of the Department of Defense, excluding military assistance, military construction, family housing and civil defense. The following table displays the major recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1991 enacted	Fiscal year 1992 request	Committee recommendation
Title I—Military personnel	78,245,467	78,016,900	78,165,985
Title II—Operation and maintenance	83,737,560	85,402,800	83,487,642
Title III—Procurement	67,176,648	63,370,700	63,058,298
Title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation	35,974,792	39,221,533	37,693,684
Title V—DBOF/revolving and management funds	1,984,200	3,400,200	3,400,200
Title VI—Other Department of Defense programs	1,476,300	1,749,600	1,708,075
Title VII—Related agencies	193,500	194,819	192,919
Title VIII—General provisions	393,000		2,007,129
(Additional transfer authority)	-2,250,000	-3,000,000	-1,000,000
Title IX—Desert Shield/Desert Storm	15,000,000		
Total, Department of Defense	284,181,467	271,356,552	269,713,932
(By transfer)			
Total funding available	284,181,467	271,356,552	269,713,932
(Transfer authority)	-2,250,000	-3,000,000	-1,000,000

BUDGET SUMMIT AGREEMENT AND 602 (B) ALLOCATION

The Appropriations Committee conformed fully to the budget resolution for defense spending in its 602(b) allocation. This allocation divided the budget authority and outlays among the subcommittees with jurisdiction over defense spending. The Defense Subcommittee has the far greatest share of defense spending. In this recommended bill, the Appropriations Committee has remained within the tight constraints of its 602(b) allocation for defense.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO
SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93-344, AS AMENDED

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1992: Subcommittee on Defense:				
Defense.....	270,244	270,243	275,222	¹ 275,218
International.....				- 1
Domestic.....				
Mandatory.....	164	164	164	164
Projection of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
1992.....				² 176,516
1993.....				47,841
1994.....				24,144
1995.....				11,217
1996 and future years.....				10,505
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1992 in bill.....	NA		NA	

¹ Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

² Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

Appropriations, 1991	\$78,245,467,000
Budget estimate, 1992	78,016,900,000
House allowance	78,753,100,000
Committee recommendation	78,165,985,000

Funds appropriated under this title provide for pay and allowances, permanent change of station travel, and various other personnel costs for the uniformed members of the armed forces. The level of active duty military personnel requested in the President's fiscal year 1992 budget is 1,886,400, which is 106,358 below the authorized end strength for fiscal year 1991. The level of Reserve and National Guard personnel requested in the fiscal year 1992 budget is 1,068,400, or 107,526 below the end strength for fiscal year 1991.

A total of \$78,016,900,000 is requested in the President's fiscal year 1992 budget for military personnel appropriations, a decrease of \$228,567,000 from fiscal year 1991. This request includes \$68,796,100,000 for active duty forces and \$9,220,800,000 for the Reserves and Guard.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The Committee recommends appropriations totaling \$78,165,985,000 in title I, military personnel, for fiscal year 1992. This amount is \$149,085,000 above the budget request and \$587,115,000 below the House allowance.

The Committee fully funds authorized end strength.

Committee appropriation recommendations are displayed in the following table:

SUMMARY OF MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS, TITLE I

[In thousands of dollars]

Service	1991	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee compared with—	
					1991	House allowance
Active:						
Army	23,927,226	24,226,100	24,526,100	24,136,000	+208,774	-390,100
Navy	19,111,067	19,597,700	19,577,700	19,603,025	+491,958	+25,325
Marine Corps	5,911,602	6,066,800	6,086,800	6,055,360	+143,758	-31,440
Air Force	19,786,172	18,905,500	18,905,500	18,838,800	-947,372	-66,700
Subtotal	68,736,067	68,796,100	69,096,100	68,633,185	-102,882	-162,915
Guard/Reserves:						
Army Reserve	2,363,300	2,192,800	2,320,800	2,298,800	-64,500	+106,000
Navy Reserve	1,645,000	1,648,600	1,718,600	1,710,600	+65,500	+62,000
Marine Corps Reserve	336,400	326,900	354,900	342,400	+6,000	+15,500
Air Force Reserve	686,800	705,300	721,500	715,100	+28,300	+9,800
Army Guard	3,379,500	3,201,700	3,395,700	3,320,400	-59,100	+118,700
Air Guard	1,098,400	1,145,500	1,145,500	1,145,500	+47,100	
Subtotal	9,509,400	9,220,800	9,657,000	9,532,800	+23,400	+312,000
Total, military personnel	78,245,467	78,016,900	78,753,100	78,165,985	-79,482	+149,085

MILITARY MANPOWER END STRENGTH

The following table summarizes adjustments to the 1992 manpower request for Active, Guard, and Reserve forces.

RECOMMENDED END STRENGTH

	1991 estimate	Budget request	Committee recommenda- tion	Committee compared with—	
				1991 estimate	Budget request
Active force:					
Army	710,000	660,200	660,200	— 49,800	
Navy	573,086	551,400	551,400	— 21,686	
Marine Corps	195,672	188,000	188,000	— 7,672	
Air Force	514,000	486,800	486,800	— 27,200	
Total, active	1,992,758	1,886,700	1,886,400	— 106,358	
Guard/Reserves:					
Army National Guard	457,300	410,900	443,380	— 13,920	+ 32,480
Army Reserve	318,700	282,700	307,900	— 10,800	+ 25,200
Navy Reserve	153,400	134,600	145,880	— 7,520	+ 11,280
Marine Corps Reserve	43,900	40,900	43,100	— 800	+ 2,200
Air National Guard	117,035	118,100	118,100	+ 1,065	
Air Force Reserve	85,591	81,200	82,400	— 3,191	+ 1,200
Total, Guard/Reserves	1,175,926	1,068,400	1,140,760	— 35,166	+ 72,360

INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

The Committee has been particularly troubled by the question of involuntary separation of members of the armed forces. For the first time in its history, this country has an all-volunteer military force, composed of people who have chosen to make a career of service to their country. Those members who do not intend to remain in the military until retirement have been willing to commit years of their lives to service.

The Committee believes it is universally understood that, because of changing world conditions, this country no longer requires as large an armed force as it has in years past. The question is how to achieve reductions in the most equitable, least painful way. The most attractive options for reducing the size of the military, such as by attrition or by reducing the numbers of personnel entering the military, either unacceptably lengthen the time it would take to make sufficient reductions or result in an unbalanced, top-heavy force.

The Committee has reluctantly come to believe that, as they prudently reduce the size of our armed forces, the military services must be allowed to take advantage of all options available to them, including involuntary separations. The Committee, therefore, has made no reductions to the military personnel accounts based on any prohibitions on involuntary separations. The Committee would, however, like to express its hope that involuntary separations can be kept to a minimum and can be made in as humane and thoughtful a way as possible.

VARIABLE HOUSING ALLOWANCE

The Committee has made reductions in the four active duty military personnel accounts based upon the requirement, submitted with the budget, that military members certify their housing costs annually (currently not mandatory). Savings occur from consolidating other certifications and surveys now completed annually by members. The savings are distributed as follows:

Army	\$2,000,000
Navy	4,275,000
Marine Corps	1,140,000
Air Force	2,200,000

OVERSEAS STATION ALLOWANCE

Foreign currency rates, which drive the overseas station allowance, have generally improved since the fiscal year 1992 budget was submitted. Savings which occur because of these improvements have been distributed to the services, as follows:

Army	\$88,100,000
Navy	33,700,000
Marine Corps	10,300,000
Air Force	64,500,000

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

Appropriations, 1991	\$23,927,226,000
Budget estimate, 1992	24,226,100,000
House allowance	24,526,100,000
Committee recommendation	24,136,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$24,136,000,000 for fiscal year 1992. This is \$90,100,000 below the budget request.

All recommended adjustments to the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]

<i>Program</i>	<i>Committee adjustments</i>
Variable housing allowance	-2,000
Overseas station allowance	-88,100
Total adjustments	-90,100
Recommended appropriation	24,136,000

ARMY CAREER ALUMNI PROGRAM

The Committee commends the Army on its Army Career Alumni Program [ACAP] designed to provide career services to separating military and civilian personnel. The Committee is impressed with the planning and implementation of the ACAP program to date and understands that ACAP will eventually be located in approximately 60 sites worldwide. The Committee's only concern is that this valuable program should be disseminated as rapidly as possible, consistent with appropriate planning, so that all separating personnel will be able to take advantage of its services.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

Appropriations, 1991	\$19,111,067,000
Budget estimate, 1992	19,597,700,000
House allowance	19,577,700,000
Committee recommendation	19,603,025,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$19,603,025,000 for fiscal year 1992. This is \$5,325,000 above the budget request.

All recommended adjustments to the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Committee adjustments
Variable housing allowance	- 4,275
Ensign "stashing"	- 8,400
Overseas station allowance	- 33,700
Delayed decommissioning	+ 51,700
Total adjustments	+ 5,325
Recommended appropriation	19,603,025

ENSIGN "STASHING"

Unlike the other military services, the Navy commissions all U.S. Naval Academy and Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps graduates immediately upon graduation. When there are no immediate job openings or training slots for these graduates, they are "stashed" in other jobs until openings become available. While the Committee can understand the Navy's interest in bringing these graduates on board immediately, it believes that, during a time of extreme fiscal constraints, this is a practice that the Navy can no longer afford. It has, therefore, made a reduction of \$8,400,000 to end the custom of ensign "stashing".

DELAYED COMMISSIONING

Delay in decommissioning the U.S.S. *Missouri*, U.S.S. *Wisconsin*, and U.S.S. *Midway* results in increased personnel costs. The Committee recommends an increase of \$51,700,000 to pay these costs, distributed as follows: U.S.S. *Missouri*, \$18,700,000; U.S.S. *Wisconsin*, \$11,000,000, and U.S.S. *Midway*, \$22,000,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

Appropriations, 1991	\$5,911,602,000
Budget estimate, 1992	6,066,800,000
House allowance	6,086,800,000
Committee recommendation	6,055,360,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,055,360,000 for fiscal year 1992. This is \$11,440,000 below the budget request.

All recommended adjustments to the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]

<i>Program</i>	<i>Committee adjustments</i>
Variable housing allowance.....	-1,140
Overseas station allowance.....	-10,300
Total adjustments.....	-11,440
Recommended appropriation	6,055,360

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

Appropriations, 1991	\$19,786,172,000
Budget estimate, 1992	18,905,500,000
House allowance	18,905,500,000
Committee recommendation	18,838,800,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$18,838,800,000 for fiscal year 1992. This is a reduction of \$66,700,000 below the budget request.

All recommended adjustments to the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]

<i>Program</i>	<i>Committee adjustments</i>
Variable housing allowance.....	-2,200
Overseas station allowance.....	-64,500
Total adjustments.....	-66,700
Recommended appropriation	18,838,800

GUARD AND RESERVE

The Committee shares the concern expressed by the Senate Armed Services Committee, the House Appropriations Committee, and the House Armed Services Committee at the size of the reductions recommended by the Department of Defense in the National Guard and Reserves. It is also concerned that the Department is apparently unable at this point to present a comprehensive plan for these reductions, even though reductions are being recommended.

The Committee has been unable to understand the reasoning behind some of the recommended reductions. For example, the Department proposes to inactivate the Army National Guard's 1st Battalion, 86th Field Artillery, in Vermont in fiscal year 1993, while, at the same time, it proposes to activate new field artillery units in the neighboring States of New York and Massachusetts. One of the problems faced by the Navy during Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm was clearing mines. Yet the Department proposes to deactivate two Navy Reserve minesweeping squadrons. The Marine Corps activated 55 percent of the Marine Corps Reserve during the gulf war, yet the Department proposes to reduce the Marine Corps Reserves over a 2-year period by 21 percent. These are but a few of the examples the Committee could cite, but they should be sufficient to indicate the inconsistencies apparent in many of the proposed reductions.

To allow sufficient time for appropriate and thoughtful planning, as well as consultations with the Congress, the Committee has in-

cluded a general provision (section 8067) which prohibits the Department from reducing the force structure allowance [FSA] for the Army National Guard and Army Reserve below 450,000 and 310,000 respectively during fiscal year 1992. It prohibits the reduction of the FSA of the other Guard and Reserve components below the end-strength levels funded in this act. Further, the end strength of the National Guard and Reserve components may not be reduced below the end-strength funded in this act. The Committee directs that, as a minimum, the FSA of all components maintain the existing combat force structure, to include special operations forces, and such other combat, combat support and combat service support as necessary to maintain the specified level. Preserving the existing force structure will not only provide an insurance force for this period of realignment of international relationships but also a locally visible military presence and a link between the military and civilian communities throughout our Nation which will foster public support for the military.

The Committee has restored funding to the "Guard and Reserve personnel" and "Operation and maintenance" accounts to support the end strength level authorized in the Senate Defense authorization bill.

While the Committee insists that the necessary reductions in National Guard and Reserve components be consistent with our Nation's security objectives, the Committee recognizes that reductions in the Guard and Reserves have been assumed in the Department's 6-year defense plan. Section 8067 further stipulates that no reductions shall be made to active component personnel and O&M appropriations to maintain the FSA. All such requirements may only be met through offsets in the procurement and research, development, test and evaluation appropriations.

NATIONAL GUARD MILITARY YOUTH CORPS

The Committee believes that this Nation is faced with a growing crisis because of the numbers of young, unemployed high school dropouts who need assistance in becoming productive members of society. The Committee also believes that the National Guard, which has a presence in every State in the Union, would be uniquely qualified to assist these young people in reclaiming their lives and becoming responsible citizens. The Committee, therefore, directs the National Guard Bureau to formulate a plan to establish National Guard Military Youth Corps projects at Camp Dawson, WV, and Camp Gruber, OK, during fiscal year 1992.

The plan to be developed by the National Guard Bureau should be designed to demonstrate how disenfranchised youth can be reclaimed through a rigorous program, based on a military model, of education, personal and skills development, and work in service to their communities. The program should be preventive rather than remedial and should be designed to assist these young people before they become involved in the criminal justice system.

The National Guard has, as its stated goal, adding value to America, and the Committee believes that a National Guard Military Youth Corps Program is one way to achieve this goal.

The Committee directs that both the Army and Air National Guard be involved in this effort and that \$2,000,000 of funds available in the "Operation and maintenance" accounts be used only for this purpose.

BENEDUM AIRPORT

The Committee directs the National Guard and Army Reserve to work with the Federal Aviation Administration, the Benedum Airport Authority, and State and local authorities to facilitate the deployment of the military reserve components' engineering capabilities to resolve the problem of site preparation and to allow for future runway extension.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

Appropriations, 1991	\$2,363,300,000
Budget estimate, 1992	2,192,800,000
House allowance	2,320,800,000
Committee recommendation	2,298,800,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,298,800,000 for fiscal year 1992. This is \$106,000,000 above the budget request.

All recommended adjustments to the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]

<i>Program</i>	<i>Committee adjustments</i>
End strength	+ 106,000
Total adjustments	+ 106,000
Recommended appropriation	2,298,800

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

Appropriations, 1991	\$1,645,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,648,600,000
House allowance	1,718,600,000
Committee recommendation	1,710,600,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,710,600,000 for fiscal year 1992. This is \$62,000,000 above the budget request.

All recommended adjustments to the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]

<i>Program</i>	<i>Committee adjustments</i>
End strength	+ 56,000
Craft of opportunity program	+ 6,000
Total adjustments	+ 62,000
Recommended appropriation	1,698,600

CRAFT OF OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM [COOP]

The recommended addition of \$6,000,000 funds military personnel to continue the Craft of Opportunity Program [COOP], a mine

countermeasures training program, which is discussed under the operation and maintenance section of this report.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

Appropriations, 1991	\$336,400,000
Budget estimate, 1992	326,900,000
House allowance	354,900,000
Committee recommendation	342,400,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$342,400,000 for fiscal year 1992. This is \$15,500,000 above the budget request.

All recommended adjustments to the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]	
<i>Program</i>	<i>Committee adjustments</i>
End strength	+ 15,500
Total adjustments	+ 15,500
Recommended appropriation	342,400

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

Appropriations, 1991	\$686,800,000
Budget estimate, 1992	705,300,000
House allowance	721,500,000
Committee recommendation	715,100,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$715,100,000 for fiscal year 1991. This is \$9,800,000 above the budget request.

All recommended adjustments to the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]	
<i>Program</i>	<i>Committee adjustments</i>
End strength	+ 9,800
Total adjustments	+ 9,800
Recommended appropriation	715,100

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

Appropriations, 1991	\$3,379,500,000
Budget estimate, 1992	3,201,700,000
House allowance	3,395,700,000
Committee recommendation	3,320,400,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,320,400,000 for fiscal year 1992. This is \$118,700,000 above the budget request.

All recommended adjustments to the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]

<i>Program</i>	<i>Committee adjustments</i>
End strength	+ 118,700
Total adjustments.....	+ 118,700
Recommended appropriation	3,320,400

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

Appropriations, 1991	\$1,098,400,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,145,500,000
House allowance	1,145,500,000
Committee recommendation.....	1,145,500,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,145,500,000 for fiscal year 1992, the same as the budget request.

TITLE II

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1991	\$83,737,560,000
Budget estimate, 1992	85,402,800,000
House allowance	87,720,527,000
Committee recommendation	83,487,642,000

The Committee recommends appropriations totaling \$83,487,642,000 in title II, operation and maintenance, for fiscal year 1992. This is \$1,915,158,000 below the budget estimate and \$4,232,885,000 below the House allowance. The Committee recommendations, by appropriation account, are compared with the budget estimate and House allowance in the following table:

SUMMARY OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

[In thousands of dollars]

	1992 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee compared with—	
				1991	Budget
O&M Army	21,886,800	18,362,945	20,913,805	-972,995	+2,550,860
O&M Navy	23,934,200	21,394,932	23,012,390	-921,810	+1,617,458
O&M Marine Corps	1,894,600	2,082,500	2,109,665	+215,065	+27,165
O&M Air Force	20,342,900	17,660,213	19,242,014	-1,100,886	+1,581,801
O&M Defense agencies	8,794,800	18,599,037	8,635,768	-159,032	-9,963,269
O&M Army Reserve	937,200	995,600	962,200	+25,000	-33,400
O&M Navy Reserve	816,100	825,500	840,600	+24,500	+15,100
O&M Marine Corps Reserve	75,900	85,900	81,700	+5,800	-4,200
O&M Air Force Reserve	1,075,400	1,091,200	1,077,000	+1,600	-14,200
O&M Army National Guard	2,080,700	2,165,600	2,125,800	+45,100	-39,800
O&M Air National Guard	2,287,800	2,275,700	2,276,300	-11,500	+600
National Rifle Board	5,000	5,000	5,000		
Court of Military Appeals	5,500	5,500	5,500		
World University Games		3,000	1,000	+1,000	-2,000
1996 Summer Olympics			2,000	+2,000	+2,000
Real property maintenance backlog			1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000
Environmental restoration	1,252,900	2,152,900	1,183,900	-69,000	-969,000
Humanitarian assistance	13,000	15,000	13,000		-2,000
Total O&M	85,402,800	87,720,527	83,487,642	-1,915,158	-4,232,885

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OVERVIEW

Appropriations under this title finance the cost of operating and maintaining U.S. Armed Forces, including Guard and Reserve components and Department of Defense agencies. These funds are used to purchase fuel and spare parts for training activities, pay civilian personnel, purchase supplies and equipment for repairing weapons systems and facilities, and finance medical and other personnel support programs.

As the country faces this time of great uncertainty in the international security environment, the Committee believes that providing adequate funding for the training and well-being of our military and civilian personnel is paramount. The success of our troops in Operation Desert Shield/Storm clearly followed from the training and other readiness-related programs supported by Congress in the past. The Committee's recommendations for fiscal year 1992 continue to support fully the readiness of our armed forces.

There are, however, a number of important considerations which have served to temper the Committee's recommendations. These are: the constrained fiscal environment; the plans to reduce and reshape our forces in future years; and, the efforts to improve the Department's operations through management and accounting initiatives. In light of these considerations and, to the extent known today, the lessons learned from Operation Desert Shield/Storm, the recommendations:

Maintain the combat readiness of the military forces.—The Committee fully supports the essential unit training activities of the armed forces. Individual, or schoolhouse, training programs are fully funded. Also, increases above the budget request are provided for equipment and facilities maintenance programs.

Use savings available from pricing and fact-of-life changes to increase funding for worthwhile programs.—Changes in the price of goods and services and certain unforeseen, fact-of-life occurrences in 1991 permit reductions to these appropriations without harming the services' 1992 plans. These savings have been used to provide additional funds for the Army's combat training centers, certain environmental activities, care for the disabled under CHAMPUS, and special operations programs.

Provide additional funds to support U.S. ship maintenance activities.—Of all the maintenance and repair activities supporting our military forces, the ship maintenance activities will experience the greatest turbulence in the years ahead. To assure that these important industrial assets remain viable as they are scaled down, the Committee provides \$250,000,000 for maintenance work and \$78,000,000 for shipyard modernization above the administration's request.

Support the Department's efforts to improve the management and efficiency of its operations.—The Committee recommends the creation of the defense business operations fund [DBOF] and supports other initiatives under the defense management review process. The Committee also provides funds to establish additional gain-sharing programs in activities which could benefit from doing so.

The Committee's recommendations reflect a balance between providing sufficient funding for training and support activities fundamental to the preparedness of our armed forces and responding to the fiscal constraints and changing security environment that the nation now faces.

SERVICEWIDE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ISSUES AND PROGRAMS

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION MATERIAL AND ACCOUNTING INFORMATION

The Committee once again is frustrated by the lack of coherent, accurate justification material submitted by the Department supporting its operation and maintenance [O&M] appropriations request. In the conference report to the 1991 Defense appropriations bill, the conferees directed that efforts be made to improve the Department's O&M justification materials. Unfortunately, the Department failed to comply with that direction. So, as has been the case in years past, the information submitted by the Department for the 1992 request was misleading, inaccurate, or insufficient to justify proposals offered by the agency. Here are but a few examples which serve to highlight the Committee's frustration:

- Inflation estimates in the Department's "National Defense Budget Estimates for Fiscal Year 1992" (commonly known as the Greenbook) differ radically from those in the O&M overview. In the Greenbook, total O&M real (after inflation) funding decreases by about \$200,000,000; in the O&M overview, real funding declines by almost \$3,800,000,000. Even though both of these documents were prepared by the Comptroller, the Committee has yet to receive an adequate explanation of why there is a \$3,600,000,000 difference and for what activities these funds are to be used.
- Data provided in the President's request for activities such as travel and printing bear no resemblance to data in the justification materials for the same categories. The differences could not be explained by the services. The Committee, in fact, was told to disregard the information provided in the President's submission.
- After repeated inquiries by the Committee, the services still cannot link savings reflected in the budget with assumed force structure reductions and/or base closures.

Further, the materials submitted by the Department do not provide sufficient information on how over \$80,000,000,000 will be spent. Since there is no audit trail between appropriations enacted for operation and maintenance and the funding proposed for execution, it is not possible to determine whether the services are complying with congressional direction.

What results from the lack of clear, accurate information is this: The Committee is precluded, in some instances, from conducting a reasonable analysis of the Department's O&M budget and program proposals.

Though the Committee supports many of the Department's 1992 initiatives to consolidate funding into the O&M accounts and revolving funds, it does so only on the expectation that future justification materials and budget information show marked improvement over those materials submitted for the 1992 request. In order to improve the information available for O&M accounts, a general provision is amended directing the Department to submit as part of its fiscal year 1993 justification materials:

- An O&M-1 similar to the P-1 and R-1 submitted for the procurement and RDT&E appropriations. This should show the

budget activity, activity group, and subactivity group for the same years as the P-1/R-1.

The Committee again looks forward to determining jointly with the Department the exact details of these submissions.

A COORDINATED NATIONAL STRATEGY

Recent world events have brought a new focus to our view of national security. The immediacy of the military threat from the Soviet Union has become more distant. The allies' success in the Persian Gulf war has proven the value of international coalition politics in dealing with regional conflicts. And, the economic component of national security has come to be seen as an essential pillar in the foundation of our continued international prominence.

With the change in the Soviet military threat and the successful conclusion of the Persian Gulf war, much of our attention has focused on the critical question: To what end our defense strategy and forces? Throughout the development of its 1992 defense budget recommendations, the Committee has wrestled with the sometimes contradictory strategic and force structure imperatives presented by these events. No doubt, the conventional military challenge to the United States has diminished, but the uncertainty of knowing from where the next challenge will likely come has increased. Thus, the Committee has supported the cautious, measured change in strategy and force reductions promoted by Secretary Cheney, General Powell, and others and has incorporated this approach in its budget recommendations.

The Committee believes, however, that too little attention has been paid to a second, equally critical question: To what end our defense industry? Many argue that the Soviet Union's economic survival rests, in part, on its ability to successfully convert military assets into productive domestic resources. Yet, as it now stands, plans for future U.S. defense forces and budget levels portend a similar, though certainly less drastic, situation for our own economy. Consider the following:

- Current DOD plans call for reductions to military personnel of over 320,000 between now and 1995. DOD civilian employee roles will be cut by 112,000 over the same period. Countless numbers of defense industry employees will face unemployment. Also, many military bases and civilian factories will be closed resulting in significant disruption to the local economies that support them.
- While some of the skills held by Department employees will transfer easily to the private sector, such as electricians or communications specialists, many will not. Those who have opted for careers in combat arms, for example, will almost certainly require retraining for other positions.
- The economic barriers which exist between the defense industry and industries in other fields serve as disincentives to corporations and individuals seeking to change their line of work. As defense budgets are reduced and the possibility of future workload diminishes, more defense-related businesses will be faced with the difficult decision of having to leave the industry.

- The cutback in departmental and defense-related private sector jobs certainly will create economic dislocation; new demands will be made on social safety net programs such as unemployment compensation, Medicaid, and job retraining programs. This, of course, will come at a time when fiscal constraints have limited the Federal Government's ability to absorb such new demands without risking increases to budget deficits.

Though the Department has initiated some programs addressing these concerns, the Committee believes the situation demands that a coordinated national strategy be developed. As an appropriate first step, the Committee recommends the establishment of the Defense Conversion Commission, a blue ribbon panel to be composed of congressional, executive branch, business, and academic leaders in the fields of defense and economics. The Commission will be tasked to:

- Define the economic and labor difficulties the Department and defense-related industry can expect to face in the foreseeable future, paying special attention to defining types of military and civilian employees that could benefit from retraining, cooperative ventures the Department and industry could undertake to ease a firm's transition from relying solely on defense contracts, and critical military industrial base assets and other resources which must be maintained;
- Recommend a coordinated national strategy to address these concerns. The Commission's recommendations should include, among others, proposals on strengthening or establishing Defense Department programs that will retrain employees in skills likely to be of demand in future labor markets. Its recommendations also should address conversion problems presented by economic barriers existing between defense-related and commercial firms.

The Commission will be composed of members jointly appointed by the administration and Congress, and will include congressional members, representatives from the Departments of Defense, Labor and Commerce, business leaders, and academic experts. The Committee earmarks \$5,000,000 under Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies to cover staff salaries, travel, and other administrative costs associated with the establishment of this Commission. The Committee expects to work with the Department and other relevant agencies to develop the Commission's exact charter, meeting and reporting schedule, and composition.

TRAINING AND OTHER READINESS-RELATED PROGRAMS

In light of plans to dramatically reduce and reshape our military forces, the Committee believes that the readiness of those remaining forces must be assured. And, with defense funding levels constrained in future years, the Committee also believes that reducing funds for readiness-related programs to pay for other defense activities must be minimized to prevent a return to the hollow forces situation of the 1970's. The Committee's recommendations fully support the continued preparedness of our armed forces, as reflected in the adjustments described below.

Training.—The administration has requested funding for operations programs allowing for military units to train at levels comparable to 1991. The Committee supports the services' essential unit training activities and, in the case of the Army, adds \$150,000,000 to the request to assure that this service meets its 1992 training goals. The Committee also fully funds the administration's request for individual training programs.

Depot maintenance.—In its 1992 budget hearings, the Committee expressed concerns about the rising level of deferred equipment maintenance due to inadequate funding (known as maintenance backlogs), especially in the case of Navy aviation equipment. After having analyzed the Department's depot maintenance funding and program proposals and having received additional information on the Department's maintenance backlogs projected for 1992, the Committee finds that:

- The Army's projected depot maintenance backlogs are smaller in 1992, compared to 1991 and previous years, and present no impediment to maintaining essential combat readiness;
- The Navy and Air Force are now projecting smaller aviation depot maintenance backlogs in 1992 compared to their projections made at the time the President's request was submitted;
- The revised levels of aviation maintenance backlogs projected for 1992 in the Navy and Air Force also present no impediment to maintaining essential combat readiness; and
- Ship maintenance backlog figures have not been revised since the submission of the President's request.

The Committee has opted for a two-track approach for reducing maintenance backlogs still to occur in 1992. First, the Committee believes that the establishment of the defense business operations fund will engender significant productivity improvements in the Department's industrial and supply operations. These improvements could lead to as much as \$242,000,000 in additional savings not reflected in the President's 1992 request. The Committee, therefore, directs that funds be transferred from the DBOF to the O&M appropriations for the express purpose of retiring depot maintenance backlogs, to the extent excess funds become available in this fund over the year. The Committee expects the Department to follow standard reprogramming procedures when transferring funds for this purpose.

Second, the Committee provides \$250,000,000 for retiring ship maintenance backlogs and other ship repairs in 1992 above the level requested in the President's budget. A more detailed discussion of the Committee's recommendations on this matter is provided under the section titled "Operation and maintenance, Navy", which appears later in this report.

The House bill provides an additional \$800,000,000 for all DOD depot maintenance activities, yet prohibits the use of these funds until the final month of fiscal year 1992. While the Committee supports the House intent to minimize maintenance backlogs, it believes that the House increase is in excess to the Department's needs and, given the House restrictions on the use of these additional funds, creates financial difficulties for the Department in future years.

Other depot maintenance matters.—The Committee strongly supports the Department's efforts to compete workload between public facilities and private concerns, known as the public/private competition program. Thus, it recommends continuing the authority provided to the Secretary to compete the acquisition of production, modification, depot maintenance, and repair of aircraft, vehicles, vessels, components, and other defense-related items between defense depot maintenance activities and private companies. The Committee believes that any defense-related work pursuant to this authority should not interfere with the primary mission of the facility involved; should be of such character as to enhance critical skills; and should be cost effective.

Because of the decrease in maintenance workload expected in the coming years as forces are drawn down, the Department plans to reduce civilian employee levels at its depot maintenance facilities. The Committee believes that, unless appropriate management actions are taken, the impending one-time increase in workload for 1992 resulting from Operation Desert Shield/Storm will preclude an orderly reduction of personnel levels at these facilities. To minimize turbulence in its depot maintenance work force, the Department is directed to allow funded carryover balances to increase from the traditional 3 months to 6 months for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 only.

Real property maintenance.—In its bill, the House added \$1,000,000,000 to the administration's request for real property, or facilities maintenance. The Committee's recommendation provides an increase of the same amount, but differs substantially in its treatment of this increase compared to the House bill: funds are provided for specific maintenance needs identified by the Department; a pilot program is established to conduct engineering surveys of our core military installations; and, a new account, entitled "Real property maintenance backlog", is created to facilitate oversight of these funds and pilot program.

Each of the specific funding adjustments described above are fully discussed under the relevant account headings found later in this section.

PRICING AND FACT-OF-LIFE ADJUSTMENTS

To protect the real value of financing for its programs, the Department includes in its budget request funds to cover price changes that are assumed to occur in current and future years. The most important of these price change assumptions affecting the O&M budget request are the annual rate of inflation in our economy (GNP inflation) and the value of the U.S. dollar compared to other foreign currencies. The Committee recommends reductions to the Department's request in light of recent favorable changes to these pricing assumptions.

Revised inflation estimates.—The President's budget assumed GNP inflation of 4.4 percent in 1991 and 3.9 percent in 1992. Those estimates were revised downward in the administration's mid-session review of the budget submitted in July 1991. The new estimates are 4 percent for 1991 and 3.8 percent for 1992. As such, estimated price growth for purchases of materials and services in the

O&M request is overstated; the Committee recommends a reduction of \$188,000,000.

Foreign currency fluctuations.—Since the submission of the President's budget in February, the value of the U.S. dollar in foreign currency exchange markets has strengthened. A reduction totaling \$796,600,000 is made to all relevant O&M accounts to reflect this improvement; a similar reduction was assumed in the Senate approved authorization bill.

The following adjustments are recommended in light of unforeseen, fact-of-life changes which have occurred in 1991 that affect funding levels proposed for 1992.

Revolving fund cash.—The Department's stock and industrial funds will end fiscal year 1991 with cash assets in excess of those planned in the budget. This results mostly from increased purchases of supplies and transportation services associated with Desert Shield/Storm activities. A reduction totaling \$400,000,000 to the O&M request is recommended but, to nullify any adverse affect on the services' programs, a general provision is amended permitting the Department to transfer excess cash from these funds to the O&M appropriations.

Civilian personnel levels.—The Committee recommends reducing funding for civilian pay by \$237,823,000 to reflect lower-than-anticipated employee levels at the start of fiscal year 1992 than assumed in the budget request. The Department's hiring freeze and other actions have resulted in civilian work force attrition greater than expected for fiscal year 1991. Thus, the agency will begin 1992 with fewer civilian employees than planned. The Committee's recommendation aligns funding for civilian pay with expected 1992 work force levels without impairing the Department's plans to gradually reduce employee levels throughout the year.

RETURN-ON-INVESTMENT PROGRAMS

With the initiation of the defense management review process in 1989 and with new proposals such as the defense business operations fund, the Department intends to recast the management and operating culture of the agency; in other words, the Department wants to change the way it does business. By reducing management overhead and implementing cost cutting measures throughout the agency, DOD confidently predicts it will save more than \$70,000,000,000 by 1997. While the Committee solidly supports these efforts, it is concerned that too little attention has been paid to making the prudent, timely investments in training and modern equipment that will enable the Department to meet its goal. To address this concern, the Committee provides additional funds for programs which will improve the Department's operations and offer a potential return on investment. The Committee encourages the Department to prudently invest in needed training and equipment but expects that investment proposals will meet the dual test of: (1) increasing productivity, and (2) offering a return on investment.

Shipyard modernization.—The Navy's shipyards are aging rapidly. Equipment and facilities critical to the work done by the shipyards are reaching the end of their useful economic lives. In par-

ticular, portal cranes at most of the yards, procured some 50 years ago, are badly in need of replacement. Despite this, the Department is requiring the shipyards to become more productive over the coming years as part of the broader effort to reduce costs at all DOD depot maintenance facilities. In anticipation of these cost-cutting improvements, the agency assumes the shipyards will save about \$1,000,000,000 of the \$3,900,000,000 expected savings from all depot maintenance activities from 1991 to 1995.

The Committee believes that, absent modest investments in shipyard modernization programs, the Department will be unable to attain the savings it anticipates in 1992 and future budget requests. Funding for modernization projects has been constrained in the President's budget request; only the most critical mission-essential items are to be purchased. No funds were budgeted for programs to improve the shipyard's productivity efforts. Thus, to further the Department's efforts to improve shipyard operations, the Committee provides an additional \$78,000,000 for modernization projects. These funds will be used to purchase new portal cranes and other equipment consistent with a plan submitted to the Committee by the Navy. The Navy estimates that these improvements will pay for themselves in 3 to 5 years. Of the additional funds provided, \$10,000,000 will be used to purchase equipment for Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard to establish nuclear refueling capabilities there for SSN-688 class submarines by 1997.

Gainsharing.—The Committee's recommendation adds \$1,000,000 to establish a fund within the Office of the Secretary of Defense for underwriting the costs of implementing gainsharing programs. Gainsharing programs—a method to provide financial rewards to employees that have introduced cost-cutting measures in their work place—have been established at several Department activities with notable success. The additional funds will be used as seed money to begin gainsharing programs at activities which could benefit from establishing such programs, but have yet to do so. The Committee believes that good ideas successfully implemented should be appropriately rewarded; in the end, of course, it is the Department which gains most. The Committee directs the Department to provide a report detailing its efforts to implement new gainsharing programs to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate by June 1, 1992.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPPORT COSTS

Travel costs.—The President's request proposes an increase in the amount of funds allocated for travel per person in each of the services. The Committee believes that, in this time of fiscal constraint, growth in travel funding is unwarranted. The Committee's recommendation reduces travel funded under this title by a total of \$83,700,000, holding travel costs per person at the 1991 level plus inflation. Air Force funding has been reduced the most in order to align its travel budget with those of the other services. The House reduced funding in this category by \$196,500,000. The House's intention was to reduce funding for travel to conferences, meetings, seminars, and other temporary duty travel lasting less than 7 days. The Committee believes that the House reduction is excessive, and

will adversely affect travel programs other than those intended by the House.

Management headquarters personnel.—Reductions to civilian personnel levels in the Navy and Air Force headquarters activities have not kept pace with personnel reductions in other areas. This will result in these services becoming increasingly management top-heavy at a time when the Department is attempting to streamline organizations. Moreover, in February of this year, the Air Force Chief of Staff proposed reductions to headquarters personnel of 20 percent over the next 4 years which were not reflected in the administration's request. The Committee's recommendation reduces personnel in Air Force headquarters activities at rates similar to those in other Air Force programs and makes the appropriate funding adjustments; reductions to Navy headquarters are made in the same fashion. The total reduction recommended by the Committee is \$33,800,000. All told, the House reduced funding for headquarters activities throughout the Department by \$320,400,000. Again, the Committee believes this reduction is excessive and will severely impair the services' ability to conduct a reasonable, measured drawdown of its civilian personnel in the coming year. The Committee also recommends striking several general provisions included by the House which restricted personnel in specific headquarters activities.

Transfer from Defense Cooperation Account.—In its fiscal year 1992 request, the Department requested funding to reconstitute maritime prepositioning ships, refurbish prepositioned war reserve stocks used by the Seabees in Desert Shield, and cover maintenance costs that accrued as a result of increased optempo during fiscal year 1991. These costs are incremental to Operation Desert Shield and should be funded from the Defense Cooperation Account [DCA]. The recommendation reduces funding by a total of \$345,000,000 for these Navy and Marine Corps support programs; language will be included in a forthcoming supplemental appropriations bill which permits transfer of funds from the DCA to the appropriate O&M accounts. A similar adjustment was made in the Senate approved authorization bill.

Arms control.—The Committee recommends an adjustment to funding for arms control-related programs due to changes in the implementation of the CFE and START agreements. The President's budget assumed certain entry-into-force dates for both treaties which, in retrospect, were optimistic. Also, certain inspection requirements assumed under the CFE Treaty and planned in the budget request have not materialized. The recommendation reduces funding by a total of \$46,500,000 to account for these schedule and requirement changes, as shown in the table below:

O&M, Army	+ \$11,800,000
O&M, Navy	- 27,400,000
O&M, Air Force	- 2,400,000
O&M, On-site Inspection Agency	- 35,300,000
O&M, Defense Logistics Agency	+ 6,800,000
Total changes	- 46,500,000

MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENTS

In the "Title V—Revolving Funds" section appearing later in this report, the Committee's recommendations regarding the proposed defense business operations fund [DBOF] are discussed fully. The items shown below discuss the effects of the Committee's actions regarding the DBOF only as they relate to the O&M appropriations.

DBOF capital budget.—The Committee reduces funding in the O&M appropriations to reflect direction in the Senate-approved authorization bill disallowing the financing of military construction projects through the DBOF.

DBOF technical corrections.—The Committee recommendations reflect technical corrections also made in the Senate approved authorization bill in conjunction with the establishment of the DBOF. Adjustments for technical corrections also have been made in selected "Procurement and RDT&E appropriation" accounts.

The DBOF military construction and technical corrections are shown by O&M appropriation account in the table below.

[In thousands of dollars]

	DBOF Milcon	DBOF technical	Total adjustment
Army.....	-\$74,700	-\$50,700	-\$125,400
Navy.....	-194,200	-5,000	-199,200
Marine Corps.....	-6,800	-1,100	-7,900
Air Force.....	-60,200	-54,000	-114,200
Defense agencies.....	-100		-100
Army Reserve.....	-2,200	-1,700	-3,900
Navy Reserve.....	-3,500	-200	-3,700
Air Force Reserve.....	-1,500	-800	-2,300
Army National Guard.....	-5,000	-10,300	-15,300
Air National Guard.....	-4,000	-2,400	-6,400
Total.....	-352,200	-126,200	-478,400

Finance activities.—The recommendation adjusts funding for these activities based on the expectation that consolidating all Department accounting programs into the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (a division of the DBOF) will result in significant savings in 1992. Despite the Department's claim that this consolidation will lead to streamlined accounting-related operations, none of the military service budgets reflects savings in this area. The Committee reduces funding for the Army, Navy, and Air Force accounting programs by \$20,000,000 each.

EXCESS SUPPLY AND REPAIR PARTS INVENTORY

The Committee notes that the Department has undertaken meaningful efforts to reduce its supply of unneeded spare and repair parts inventory. As a result, excess items have been disposed of more quickly, onhand and projected inventory levels have decreased, and the demand for parts has declined. Yet, the Committee believes that much more needs to be done. One proven method for reducing excess inventory without harming readiness is to selectively limit the amount of supplies purchased each year by the

revolving funds. Thus, section 8102 prohibits the Department from incurring obligations against the stock funds in excess of 80 percent of sales from such funds in fiscal year 1992, except for obligations for fuel, retail operations, commissary and subsistence items, medical supplies, depot level equipment repair, and the costs of operation. This provision allows for a waiver of the 80-percent limitation should the Secretary of Defense determine that such action is required to preserve the national security of the United States, as was done in fiscal year 1991.

In its bill, the House reduced O&M funding by \$355,000,000 using the rationale that the Department had spare and repair parts in excess to its needs for 1992. Yet, the House also added \$600,000,000 above the administration's O&M request to purchase additional spare and repair parts to sustain forces in combat. The Committee believes that this apparently contradictory approach to funding spare and repair parts purchases justifies neither the House adds nor its reductions. Therefore, the Committee recommends no increase for purchases of additional spare parts and recommends no reductions to the service and Defense Agency budgets for excess spare and repair parts inventories.

MARITIME PREPOSITIONING

The Committee concurs with the Senate approved authorization bill proposal to transfer control of the Department's maritime prepositioning assets to the Marine Corps. The Committee strongly supports the Maritime Prepositioning Program and believes that this management change will assure that it receives appropriate funding in the coming years.

CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS

The Committee recommends a reduction of \$255,800,000 from the budget for classified programs. These programmatic adjustments are explained in a classified annex to this report.

MEALS, READY-TO-EAT

The requirement to provide combat rations to deployed forces during Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, and the use of such rations again in Operation Provide Comfort, underscore the importance of that part of our industrial base which provide this support. A review of annual production requirements for meals, ready-to-eat [MRE] identified by the Defense Logistics Agency over the past 10 years reveals a significant fluctuation from year to year and suggests the difficulty suppliers have in projecting work force and capitalization requirements. The Committee is pleased to learn that the Department of Defense intends to procure at least 3.1 million cases of MRE's during fiscal year 1992 to meet the requirements of the military services. The Committee directs that the portion of the 3.1 million cases for which funding was not requested in the budget submission shall be paid for out of funds available in the Department of Defense operation and maintenance accounts. The Committee also directs the Department of Defense to announce MRE

procurement objectives for each of the future years defense program [FYDP] with each FYDP submission.

The Committee understands that the Defense Logistics Agency [DLA] is now working on a study to verify the minimum annual sustaining rate necessary to maintain the MRE industrial base. The Committee directs DLA to work closely with the MRE industry in arriving at the minimum sustaining rate.

The Committee is aware that MRE's served the military well in the Persian Gulf war, but the Committee believes that improvements can be made. To that end, the Committee directs DLA and the Defense Personnel Support Center to work with the MRE industry in developing alternative menus to the current DPSC specifications in order to provide a more attractive, balanced, and palatable selection of entrees for the field ration feeding system. The Committee requests that DPSC report to the Committees on Appropriations on the MRE alternatives identified in this regard.

ENERGY

Over the past several years, the Committee has expressed its concern over the implementation of an energy conversion policy at the Kaiserslautern military community [KMC] in the Federal Republic of Germany. It has always been the Committee's intention that American anthracite coal be considered as part of any plan to convert heating facilities on American military bases or in any system on which American military facilities would be dependent.

The Committee is encouraged to learn that the mayors of the three cities which comprise the Kaiserslautern military community, Kaiserslautern, Landstuhl, and Ramstein-Miesenbach, have indicated their intention to use U.S. anthracite coal whenever practical and feasible as the base load energy source in heating facility conversions in their communities.

The Committee has included a general provision (section 8008) agreeing with the House in prohibiting the purchase of foreign coal or coke for use at U.S. defense facilities in Europe when U.S. coal is available and prohibiting the conversion of heating plants from coal to oil or natural gas, except as provided in section 2690 of title 10, United States Code, and 30 days after the Secretary of Defense has notified the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate. The Committee has deleted House bill language (section (c) of section 8008 of the House bill) addressing the conversion of heating facilities in the KMC. The Committee has recommended a substitute provision which permits the issuance of a request for proposal for heat from the regional district heating authority or authorities in the KMC pursuant to a determination under title 10, United States Code, section 2690, and provided the Secretary of the Air Force determines that the cities in the KMC have enacted district heat statutes in accordance with host nation law. These statutes must adhere to the principle of equal treatment for all and must not single out or target U.S. facilities in the KMC. Further, any proposal must provide cost-effective heat over the life cycle of the district heating system. If the KMC fails to enact such statutes, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to continue

the process of seeking requests for proposal for a district heating system.

BIG BROTHERS/BIG SISTERS

The Committee commends Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America for its work in providing adult mentors for disadvantaged or otherwise at-risk children across the United States. It further commends this organization for its willingness to work with the Department of Defense in providing mentors for dependent children. The Committee directs the Department to cooperate with Big Brothers/Big Sisters to increase the visibility of these programs at Defense installations both in this country and overseas.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL ISSUES

COORDINATED CARE

The Committee commends the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs for his new coordinated care program through which he intends to address the many needs of the military health care system. Unlike the House, which believes coordinated care to be just another version of catchment area management projects, this Committee believes the Secretary intends to use the most successful elements of catchment area management, the CHAMPUS reform initiative, Veterans Affairs/Department of Defense sharing agreements, and other innovative health care programs in the Department of Defense, as part of his coordinated care plan. The Committee agrees with his approach and encourages him to disseminate planning directives to the services as soon as they are available.

The Committee does not agree with the House that all innovative health care programs and demonstration projects should be frozen until 1994. Although the catchment area management projects, for example, have not been fully evaluated, there are elements of these projects which have worked well everywhere they have been tried, and the Committee believes the Department should be able to use them as coordinated care is implemented. The Committee believes that delaying implementation of coordinated care can only result in increased costs as the costs of medical care continue to rise.

COORDINATED HEALTH CARE AGENCY

The House has created a so-called coordinated health care agency by consolidating all medical funding into a single account. This Committee believes that, before such a momentous step is taken, the Department of Defense should have an opportunity to participate in planning the scope and direction such an agency would take and, accordingly, it has restored funding for health care to the individual services as requested in the budget submission.

The Committee understands that, as this report is being written, the Department itself is studying the future configuration of the military health care system. In this connection, the Committee would like to quote a sentence from its report on the fiscal year 1990 Defense appropriations bill: " * * * the Committee would like

to emphasize its belief that any effort to create a single purple suit medical department could create morale problems which would largely offset other benefits which might be gained." The Department might wish to consider contracting with the Institute of Medicine at the National Academy of Sciences to determine what changes in the military health care system would be most beneficial.

ENROLLMENT

The House has made a distinction between what it refers to as "forced" and "enforced" enrollment in health care plans under the military health care system. The Committee understands that, under the House's definitions, enforced enrollment means that beneficiaries may choose their health-care providers and simply notify the Department of Defense of their choices. To this Committee, under the House's definition of enforced enrollment, each beneficiary is a minicontractor over whom the Department has little or no control, making it impossible for the Department to effect cost savings. The essence of managed care, a concept with which the House apparently agrees, is to obtain control over all health care for all beneficiaries, in order to provide the highest quality, most cost-effective care. Even under a so-called forced enrollment plan—whereby the Department decides where a beneficiary receives care—beneficiaries have an option not to enroll, albeit failure to enroll, where enrollment is offered, may involve financial penalties. The Committee hopes that it will be possible to provide for enrollment in health care plans with as little use of penalties as possible. While the Committee can understand the reluctance of some beneficiaries to embrace a managed care system, including enrollment, it believes that managed care proposals by the Department of Defense mirror what is being done in the civilian community in an effort to bring down costs while maintaining the highest level of care, and the Committee supports the Department's efforts.

UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES

The House has included a general provision (section 8072) which would prohibit enrollment of a new class of students at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences [USUHS] after September 30, 1991, that is, the provision would terminate the university after its presently enrolled students graduate. The Committee wishes to reiterate its strong support for this unique medical school and has deleted the House provision. At the instigation of the Congress in fiscal year 1991, the university, under the able leadership of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, began a reorganization which has resulted in a streamlined and more efficient institution. The Committee believes that the Department has made a good-faith effort to bring a more businesslike approach to operation of the university and that its efforts will continue in the future. In addition to providing courses for its students not taught in any civilian medical schools in this country, the university produces physician and nonphysician health care providers who are trained for their specific missions in the military and in

the Public Health Service. The Committee continues its strong support for the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.

PATIENT LEVEL ACCOUNTING

The Committee agrees with the House that the Department should develop a better costing methodology in military hospitals to allow recoupment from third-party payers of the true cost of providing patient care. Rather than undertaking such a development on a departmentwide basis, the Committee directs that the Department begin at one or two sites, to be selected by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, so that, before a new methodology is instituted, it will have been tested for effectiveness and ease of implementation. The Committee also directs that, if feasible, at least one of the chosen sites should be where there is a DOD/Veterans Affairs sharing agreement. The Committee requests that the General Accounting Office participate in the design and implementation of this initiative.

CHAMPUS REFORM INITIATIVE

The House has included language in a general provision (section 8032) that would extend the present CHAMPUS reform initiative [CRI] contract, noncompetitively, until February 1, 1994. The Department has already begun the process of recompeting the CRI contract. In addition, a provision in the Senate version of the Defense authorization bill prohibits the extension of this contract noncompetitively. Consequently, the Committee has deleted the House language to extend the current CRI contract noncompetitively.

The House has also encouraged expansion of CRI into the States of Washington and Oregon, as well as to New Orleans and the Norfolk area. This Committee opposes expansion of the CHAMPUS reform initiative and directs that no expansion occur in fiscal year 1992.

PEDIATRIC-EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

The Committee notes the progress made in developing assessment criteria for the pediatric emergency services training program. In fiscal year 1991, \$300,000 was appropriated to the Office of the Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs for the Department to complete the establishment of a systemwide educational program for the multidisciplinary military health team with a curriculum, including appropriate assessment/intervention techniques to care for acutely ill/injured children. The program should support requirements for a clinical continuum of care and be tested in conjunction with ongoing catchment area management demonstrations. Within 1 year, there should be an assessment of at least two sites' needs, the design and pilot implementation of the training at one site, and the design of a program evaluation. The impact of the education should be evaluated 1 year after pilot implementation. The Committee continues to believe DOD would be well served to use the clinical and training expertise of a nationally recognized

pediatric medical center. The Committee also wishes to assure that nursing expertise is actively involved.

NURSING PRODUCTIVITY STUDY

Beginning in fiscal year 1990, the Army has provided funding for a demonstration program at Tripler Army Medical Center to test the idea that dollars spent on additional ancillary personnel will improve nurse productivity and satisfaction. This program got off to a slow start, in part because of a civilian hiring freeze. Preliminary indications are, now that the project is in operation, that the study is proceeding well and that valuable lessons are being learned. The Committee is pleased that the Army has provided \$1,720,000 to continue this study in fiscal year 1992. The Committee directs that a final report on the program be provided to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House no later than June 30, 1992.

TEXTBOOK OF MILITARY MEDICINE

The Committee applauds the Surgeon General of the Army for supporting publication of a 22-volume textbook of military medicine designed to provide a scientific basis for the medical department and its wartime mission and to form the basis for a military unique curriculum. Two volumes have been published, with the last one, "Conventional Warfare: Ballistic, Blast and Burn Injuries," arriving in time for use by medical officers deployed to Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm. Future volumes will contain detailed treatises on topics judged essential to the total readiness of the Medical Corps. This textbook is a tribute to the dedicated men and women who contributed to its publication.

NURSING RESEARCH

The Committee has added \$1,000,000 to research, development, test and evaluation, Defense agencies, to allow military nurses to conduct clinical nursing research in such subjects as access to care, child abuse, health care delivery, family stress associated with wartime injury/separation, lead poisoning, and clinically relevant studies impacting on those eligible for military health care services. The Committee is pleased with the collaboration of the Tri Service Nursing Research Group and the National Center for Nursing Research.

The research proposals will be reviewed and recommended by the Tri Service Nursing Research Group and approved by the Chiefs of the Army and Air Force Nurse Corps and the Director of the Navy Nurse Corps. Approved research projects will be funded by the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences out of the additional funds.

The Committee encourages these Nurse Corps to continue their collaboration with the National Center for Nursing Research related to these research activities.

POSTDOCTORAL PSYCHOLOGY FELLOWSHIPS

The Committee continues to believe that it is important that psychology postdoctoral fellowships be consolidated wherever possible to create the necessary critical mass for quality training experiences. The Committee wishes to be assured that last year's directive that Army positions are transferred to Tripler Army Medical Center is followed and, further, that necessary training and support staff are provided. The Committee also recommends that the Navy begin a similar program at at least one of its major training centers and, in addition, that there be departmentwide postdoctoral psychology training at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences in its Department of Medical Psychology. As with the various medical specialties, opportunities for civilian psychologists and those in the Department of Veterans Affairs to receive clinical training should be encouraged where appropriate.

NONPHYSICIAN HEALTH CARE PROVIDER CONCERNS

The Committee was pleased with the efforts of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs [ASD/HA] to be responsive to various concerns raised by the nonphysician health care providers, especially in the area of promotion opportunities. The Committee urges the ASD/HA to implement the board specialty diplomate pay bonus, as authorized, for military psychologists.

The Committee requests a report from the ASD/HA regarding the extent to which military psychologists are currently provided hospital privileges (admitting, discharge, and treatment privileges). The Committee understands that some services allow some psychologists to admit to some beds. The Committee feels that a uniform policy would be more appropriate and further urges the Secretary to institute a permissive policy.

The Committee further requests the ASD/HA to ensure that, in its efforts to develop uniform mental health care standards during the coming year, all relevant health care provider disciplines (and their professional associations) are involved in the process. The Committee has been pleased with the progress made over the past several years to ensure that mental health care is considered interdisciplinary in nature and is specially concerned that the proposed standards might be used to "remedicalize" mental health care, that is, to insist that one discipline provide supervision for the nonphysician disciplines. Such an approach would be opposed by the Committee.

SOCIAL WORK

The Committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs to expedite the establishment of separate departments of social work at all military hospitals. The need for separate services was reaffirmed during Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm. Military and civilian social workers provided critical support to military personnel and their families both in the gulf and in the United States.

NONPHYSICIAN MEDICAL FACILITY COMMANDERS

The Committee congratulates the Department of the Air Force, and, in particular, the Surgeon General of the Air Force, for having as commanders of almost 24 percent of its medical facilities nonphysician health care professionals, including Medical Service Corps officers, nurses, dentists, and allied scientists. The Committee would commend this model to both the Army and the Navy.

PSYCHOLOGISTS PRESCRIBING DRUGS

The Committee agrees with the House general provision (section 8075) which allows continuation of a program to train military psychologists to prescribe drugs. The Committee does not, however, agree with language in the House report which would prohibit further training programs or utilization of psychologists who have received training in prescription. The Committee feels strongly that this program should be allowed to continue without prohibitions, in line with the language contained in the general provision, and until evaluation of the program has been completed, at which time it can be revisited.

NURSING RECRUITMENT DEMONSTRATION INITIATIVE

The House has earmarked \$2,500,000 for a nursing recruitment demonstration initiative and has charged the Department of the Army with the initiative.

In the fiscal year 1990 conference report on the Defense appropriations bill, the conferees directed the Department of Defense to develop a feasibility/implementation plan for a Federal nursing school to provide nurses not only for the Department of Defense, but also for the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Indian Health Service. In this Committee's report on the fiscal year 1991 Defense appropriations bill, the Committee directed that "a decision on the need for and location of a Federal nursing school shall be based on cost effectiveness, as well as the potential benefits to the Federal Government."

The Committee understands that the House initiative would be targeted to a junior college with an accredited 2-year nursing school, while the military services are now recruiting baccalaureate degree (4-year) nurses. The Committee further understands that facilities at this junior college are inadequate to house additional nursing students and that the Army would be committed to a long-term lease of a building that has yet to be built.

While the Committee applauds the House's effort to provide more nurses to the Army, it feels that such a program should be done competitively (there are a number of other nursing schools which are anxious to compete as sites for a Federal nursing school and which believe they could provide the services more cost effectively) and on the basis of the feasibility/implementation plan mandated in the fiscal year 1990 conference report. The Committee further feels that any Federal nursing school should be designed to provide nurses to all of DOD, and to other Federal agencies, not just to the Army. Accordingly, the Committee has not agreed with the House's earmarking.

NONAVAILABILITY STATEMENTS

The Committee agrees with the House in supporting the Department of Defense's plan to require nonavailability statements for a wider range of outpatient procedures. The Committee especially encourages the Department to include outpatient mental health among those procedures requiring nonavailability statements.

CHARLESTON CATCHMENT AREA MANAGEMENT PROJECT

The Committee wishes to congratulate the Department of the Navy on the success of its catchment area management [CAM] project in the Charleston, SC, area. It believes that one of the prime reasons for the project's success has been the careful planning that went into the project before it was implemented. While the Committee realizes that the Charleston project had the advantage of having access to the composite health care system [CHCS], it believes that the Navy has a most thoughtful and well-reasoned approach to managing care. The Navy's approach would appear to be adaptable to all Services, regardless of their access to CHCS.

LEAD POISONING

The Committee agrees with the House's concern about the hazards of lead poisoning to American children and further agrees that actions should be taken to determine the extent to which children of military families are affected by lead poisoning. While it is true that the military services have thousands of older housing units, some of which may indeed have been painted with lead paint in the past, the military services repaint these units cyclically, and since the use of lead-based paint was prohibited, have repainted them anywhere from three to five times with nonlead-based paint. Covering lead-based paint with nonlead-based paint is only palliative, but it is probable that covering lead-based paint will prevent its dissemination into the environment temporarily. Thus, the potential hazard in family housing may not be an immediate problem.

In the Senate-passed Defense authorization bill, there is a provision that would authorize, as part of currently authorized infant care, well baby care that includes one screening of an infant for the level of lead in the blood of the infant. The Committee applauds this provision but feels that, before mandating a sweeping testing of all military dependent children, as mandated in the House appropriations report, it would be wise to determine how much of a problem exists. Therefore, the Committee directs that tests be undertaken at least two sites, including sites in Hawaii and Nevada, to determine whether lead poisoning in children is a problem among military dependents. The Committee would expect the results of this test to be available to the two Appropriations Committees not later than June 30, 1992.

In addition, the Committee directs that the four military services present to the Committees, no later than June 30, 1992, plans showing a systematic, programmed approach to detecting and correcting any problems with lead-based paint on military facilities.

EYE CARE STUDY

The military services have established separate departments of optometry at their military hospitals, and, according to all reports, these separate departments have worked well. To quote from a letter to this Committee from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs dated March 15, 1991, "the establishment of separate departments of * * * optometry * * * at our medical centers has worked well, resulting in improved morale and better utilization of the Department's medical staff." This letter transmitted a report on the separate departments. The House report mandates that the Department of Defense initiate an evaluation of the success of the separate departments of optometry, based upon letters from ophthalmologists who say that their views were not incorporated into the Department's report. The Committee does not agree with the need for such a report. An independent study of the initial test site was done in 1989, and both optometry and ophthalmology were required to participate in the study. The study concluded that the concept worked well. The Committee believes that having separate departments of optometry is cost effective, that quality of eye care is improved, and that further studies are unnecessary.

HEAD/NECK INJURY

The House has provided \$3,233,000 to the Department of the Navy to initiate a study of DOD victims of head and neck injuries. The Committee agrees with the House that tracking head injury victims, ensuring that they are getting proper treatment, studying outcomes, and counseling victims' family members is worthwhile. However, the Committee feels that the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences is in a unique position to head this initiative and recommends that the work be carried out by the university.

CHAMPUS HOME HEALTH CARE

The Committee agrees with the House in urging the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs to investigate the possibility of including comprehensive home health care as a CHAMPUS benefit. It appears to the Committee that providing more health care at home is at once beneficial to patients and also is a cost-effective means of providing health care.

LETTERMAN ARMY MEDICAL CENTER

The House has directed the Department of the Army to maintain Letterman Army Medical Center [LAMC] at 185 beds during fiscal year 1992 rather than the 100 beds envisioned in the budget submission. The House included an additional \$44,400,000 for this purpose. The Committee has learned that the average number of inpatients at Letterman is now fewer than 100 per day and that additional beds are not needed. In addition, beneficiaries in the San Francisco area are eligible for health care coverage under the CHAMPUS reform initiative.

The Committee understands that the Department of Veterans Affairs has evinced interest in acquiring LAMC. The Committee be-

lieves that this would be a viable solution to problems envisioned by the House and directs the Department of the Army to cooperate with the Department of Veterans Affairs in exploring this option.

The Committee has not included additional funding to maintain 185 beds at LAMC.

PACIFIC ISLANDER PATIENTS

The Committee continues a provision in section 8021 of the general provisions that would allow Tripler Army Medical Center to pay for transportation and treatment, on a nonreimbursable basis, of civilian patients from American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, and Guam to assist in Tripler's graduate medical education program. The Committee is pleased that the Army has again funded this program. The Committee has learned that Tripler can treat more than 250 patients for the same funding and has, therefore, removed the cap on the number of patients who may be treated.

NATIONAL MUSEUM OF HEALTH AND MEDICINE

The National Museum of Health and Medicine, administered by the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, was moved off The Mall to a site at Walter Reed Army Medical Center in 1968. Since that time visitation has declined substantially, and the museum has had inadequate funding to maintain its facility.

Last year, the Committee directed the Department of Defense to work cooperatively with other agencies of the Federal Government, such as the Public Health Service or the National Institutes of Health, to establish a new museum facility and to determine if it would be more appropriate to have the museum as a component of the Department of Health and Human Services. The Committee repeats this direction and urges the Department to proceed expeditiously in solving this problem.

FEDERAL HEALTH CARE AGENCY

The House has provided \$3,000,000 in additional funding for the establishment of a Federal health care agency as a cooperative venture between the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Indian Health Service. The Committee believes that this action is premature. The Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs are both now in the process of re-examining and reorganizing their own medical activities, and, so far as this Committee is aware, the Indian Health Service has not evinced interest in such an initiative. The Committee does not agree with the establishment of a Federal health care agency at this time.

The Committee would, however, like to commend the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs on the effectiveness of sharing agreements now in effect. It urges these two departments to continue their cooperation so that better and more cost effective care may be provided to all their beneficiaries.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS NURSING BONUS EXPANSION

The Committee agrees with the House in encouraging the Department of Defense to expand its Selected Reserve nursing/physician bonus program authorized in the Fiscal Year 1989 Defense Authorization Act. The Committee understands that, under regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Defense, a test program is in operation in the United States, primarily in the Midwest. The Committee understands that the Selected Reserves believe that expansion of the geographical area of the test will allow the Reserves to attract additional nurses and physicians. The Committee, therefore, directs that the Department extend this test program to include the entire United States.

TIDEWATER TRI-CAM PROJECT

The Committee has been most interested in the Tidewater Tri-CAM (or Tri-Care) project and has been disappointed in the length of time it has taken to get this project up and running. It is the Committee's understanding that, until very recently, the project has largely been a one-man operation and that resources dedicated to the project have been inadequate. According to the General Accounting Office, Tri-Care is only now developing a concept of operations and a budget. Since the Tidewater catchment area is one of the largest in the country and since more than one service is involved, the Committee believes that this area can be a model for other catchment area projects. The Committee encourages the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs to assist the Navy, as lead agency for the program, to proceed expeditiously with development and implementation of the Tri-Care project.

The Committee wishes to make clear that it does not intend for the Tidewater project to be used to extend the CHAMPUS reform initiative.

FORT BRAGG MENTAL HEALTH DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

The Committee has supported the Fort Bragg mental health demonstration project, because it believes that provision of high-quality, cost-effective, managed mental health care should be available to children and adolescents of military service members. This demonstration project was initiated to test whether that care could be provided in a managed care model at less cost and less restrictively (for example, outpatient or home health care rather than inpatient care) than in previous models used by the Department of Defense.

The Committee wishes to make clear that it continues to support the Fort Bragg project. However, it is concerned that the costs of the project have increased from \$5,000,000 in fiscal year 1990 to \$14,227,738 in fiscal year 1991. While part of that increase may have occurred because of increased demand during Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, most of it does not appear to be attributable to the war in the Persian Gulf.

The Committee has also been aware of differences between the Department of the Army and the prime contractor. The Committee believes that now may be the proper time for a breathing space

during which the contractor and the Army sit down together to try and reassess this demonstration in order to develop a more streamlined, less costly project. Accordingly, the Committee has capped the Fort Bragg mental health demonstration project at \$14,000,000 in fiscal year 1992 in the general provisions (section 8065).

U.S. MILITARY MEDICAL ENHANCEMENT PROJECT

The Committee believes that cooperation between the Department of Defense and Israel on the administration of level one emergency medicine and trauma care could significantly enhance United States wartime readiness and provide much needed benefits to United States military personnel traversing the Middle East in peacetime.

The Committee recognizes an evolving need for trauma care in the Middle East as the United States increases its military presence in the region in the aftermath of Operation Desert Storm. Israel is a logical support center for regional medical services, both because of its high level of medical care and because of the large numbers of American servicemen and women stationed nearby. The 70,000 sailors and airmen operating in the Mediterranean as part of the Navy's 6th Fleet make frequent use of the port of Haifa. The accidental sinking of a ferry boat in December of last year as it transported servicemen between Haifa and the U.S.S. *Saratoga*, demonstrates the need for extensive trauma care cooperation.

The Committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs to work in consultation with the Southwest Center for the Study of Hospital and Health Care Systems, Houston, TX, to conduct a study of the requirements for an emergency medicine/trauma care program between the Department of Defense and Israel, the feasibility of establishing such a program, its projected cost, including Israel's willingness to provide matching funds, and its likely content. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs should report back to the Committee, no later than July 1, 1992, on the results of his study.

ALASKA AIR NATIONAL GUARD MEDICAL FACILITIES

The Alaska Air National Guard has significantly expanded operations at Kulis Air National Guard Base with the addition of the 210th Air Rescue Squadron. The Committee expects the Director of the Air National Guard to review the existing medical facilities at Kulis Air National Guard Base and determine what improvements in facilities, equipment, or personnel are necessary to support the various units at this base. A report providing the findings of this review and recommendations for meeting the medical service needs of the Alaska Air National Guard should be provided to the Committee not later than April 15, 1992.

DEFENSE MEDICAL FACILITIES OFFICE [DMFO]

The Committee has addressed in this report its support for medical services to military personnel and dependents. Critical to providing quality medical services are adequate medical facilities. The

Committee is concerned about the role and function of the Defense Medical Facilities Office [DMFO] in meeting the facilities needs of the military medical system. The Committee understands that specific requirements for facilities are identified and developed by the military services, and that construction programs are managed by the service facilities commands or the Army Corps of Engineers. The value added by DMFO to this process is not clear. The Committee strongly supports the role of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs in setting priorities, but believes that the military services may be better situated and more efficient in executing facilities programs.

The Committee requests that the Deputy Secretary of Defense review the role and mission of DMFO and evaluate whether or not the military services could more efficiently develop and execute medical facility programs, with the coordination and approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs. The results of this review should be provided to the Committee not later than March 15, 1992. Both the Defense and Military Construction Subcommittees will review the future role and contributions of DMFO to the service medical facilities programs during hearings on the fiscal year 1993 budget request.

ASSISTANT SURGEON GENERAL OF THE ARMY FOR VETERINARY SERVICES

The Committee wishes to acknowledge the services rendered by the Assistant Surgeon of the Army for Veterinary Services. The Assistant Surgeon General and the dedicated professionals who work with him contribute immeasurably to the health and well-being of the men and women in our Armed Services and their families, and the Committee feels that their contributions should be appropriately recognized.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

Appropriations, 1991	\$21,571,694,000
Budget estimate, 1992	21,886,800,000
House allowance	18,362,945,000
Committee recommendation	20,913,805,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$20,913,805,000. This is \$972,995,000 below the budget estimate and \$2,550,860,000 above the House allowance.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	House adjustments	Committee adjustments	Committee compared with House adjustments
Fiscal year 1992 budget request	21,886,800	21,886,800	
General purpose forces:			
Combat training centers	20,000	20,000	
Army training operations		150,000	+ 150,000

[in thousands of dollars]

Program	House adjustments	Committee adjustments	Committee compared with House adjustments
Central supply and maintenance:			
Total package fielding.....	170,000		-170,000
Umatilla Army Depot.....	350		-350
AAFES relocation.....	8,000		-8,000
Second destination transportation.....		-60,000	-60,000
Training and other personnel activities:			
Fort Irwin education project.....	22,000		-22,000
New training helicopter leases.....	-30,000		+30,000
General increase.....	6,800		-6,800
Administration and associated activities:			
Airborne and Special Ops Museum.....	4,000		-4,000
National D-Day Museum.....	4,000		-4,000
Celebrations.....	700		-700
Reproduction/printing.....		-15,000	-15,000
Personnel adjustment.....		1,000	+1,000
DBOF adjustment.....	-407,200	-125,400	+281,800
Excess inventories.....	-90,000		+90,000
Classified programs.....	-254,324	-142,700	+157,624
Department/command headquarters.....	-131,800		+131,800
Travel.....	-73,000	-28,000	+45,000
RPM backlogs.....	450,000		-450,000
Depot maintenance backlogs.....	36,800		-36,800
Medical programs.....	-3,319,081		+3,319,081
Foreign national employees.....	-110,000		+110,000
Base closure contingency.....	-41,000		+41,000
Reserve/Guard offset.....	-20,000		+20,000
Benefits transfer from OSD.....	30,200		-30,200
Transient lodging/billeting.....	-70,000		+70,000
Meals-ready-to-eat.....	67,700		-67,700
Spares and repair parts.....	152,000		-152,000
Chemical and equipment training.....	50,000		-50,000
Civilian personnel underexecution.....		-27,700	-27,700
Foreign currency repricing.....		-510,200	-510,200
Revolving fund excess cash.....		-100,000	-100,000
CIM/other ADP.....		-77,895	-77,895
Purchases inflation reestimate.....		-48,900	-48,900
Arms control.....		11,800	+11,800
Finance activities.....		-20,000	-20,000
Total.....	18,362,945	20,913,805	+2,550,860

COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Army training operations.—The Committee adds funding for Army training operations to assure that the service meets its land forces and aircraft training goals in 1992. The Army has made overly optimistic assumptions about savings amounts to be garnered from force structure reductions and base closures, putting at risk its ability to meet 1992 training requirements. Moreover, during preparation of its request, the service underfunded the training program due to a technical error. The recommendation provides \$150,000,000 above the Army's request for training operations funding, thereby nullifying any need for transferring funds from other Army activities to cover unit training costs.

Combat training centers.—The Committee recommends \$20,000,000 be added to the request for the Army's combat training centers. Training at these centers was a crucial element in the preparation of our Army troops for Operation Desert Shield/Storm, as testified to by General Schwarzkopf and others. The additional funds are to be used for upgrading equipment and instrumentation and for increasing training activities, in accordance with a plan submitted by the Army to the Committee. The House allowance also provides an increase for these programs in the same amount.

Second destination transportation.—Funding for this program pays for the costs of shipping equipment and material after initial delivery by the contractor. The fiscal year 1992 budget request includes an increase of almost \$120,000,000 to cover costs of redistributing equipment assigned to military units affected by force reductions, especially those forces redeploying from Europe. The Army's requirements to move forces from Europe to the United States in 1992, however, have diminished as a consequence of Operations Desert Shield/Storm. Some of the forces scheduled to return to the United States in 1992 have already done so; others await a final decision on their deployment plans. The recommendation reduces funding for this program by \$60,000,000, but still provides sufficient funding to meet the Army's transportation needs this coming year. For those forces affected by Operation Desert Shield/Storm, funds are available from the Defense Cooperation Account to cover their transportation costs from the Gulf.

Reproduction and printing.—The Army request would increase funding for this program by about 9 percent above the 1991 level and a full 36 percent above the 1990 level, in terms of dollars allocated per person. This growth is unwarranted in light of the Department's efforts to introduce management information systems throughout its support establishment and consolidate printing functions into one agency. The recommendation reduces the request by \$15,000,000, thereby aligning Army spending in this area with that of the other services.

Operating tempo costs.—The Committee notes with alarm the dramatic increases in the costs per flying hour and tank mile reflected in the Army budget, even after discounting for the accounting changes associated with purchasing depot level repairables. Since the Committee has received no adequate explanation on why such increases have occurred, the Secretary of the Army is directed to provide to the Committees on Appropriations in the Senate and House an analysis of the trend in operating tempo costs from 1985 to 1993 no later than March 1, 1992. This analysis should identify the effects on operating costs from changes in both force composition and accounting methods for both land and air forces.

Yakima firing center.—The Committee is aware that the Army has made important efforts to consult the Yakima Indian Nation and other native Americans on its planned expansion of the Yakima Firing Center. Yet, the Committee believes that these native Americans' historical and cultural concerns over the proposed expansion have not been fully addressed by the Army, thus blocking the attainment of a suitable agreement between the affected parties. Therefore, the Secretary of the Army is directed to provide to the Committees on Appropriations in the Senate and

House a report detailing the status of Army plans to expand the Yakima Firing Center and consultations with the Yakima Indian Nation and other native Americans affected by this proposal. The report shall be submitted on or before March 1, 1992. Also, the Committee directs the Army to delay the planned expansion until after the aforementioned report is submitted. The Army is encouraged to continue its consultations with the Yakimas and other native Americans in an effort to reach an appropriate agreement on the Army's plans.

Presidio Army Base.—The Presidio Army Base, CA, is scheduled to be closed in 1995, at which time the Department of the Interior will assume management control of the lands and facilities. To ease the transfer of management responsibility between these agencies, the Committee urges the Department of Defense to continue consultations with the Department of the Interior on the emergency repair and maintenance projects which must be started prior to 1995. Also, the Defense Department is encouraged to seek a cost-sharing arrangement with the Interior Department to assure that no degradation of the facilities occurs prior to the transfer. The Committee directs the Department to provide to the Committees on Appropriations a report detailing emergency repair and maintenance requirements at the Presidio and the status of its negotiations with the Department of the Interior by March 1, 1992. In addition, the Committee directs the Army to provide at least \$10,000,000 to cover costs of emergency and deferred maintenance repairs in fiscal year 1992.

Army JCS exercises.—The Army requested funding of over \$72,000,000 for its 1992 JCS exercise program, almost \$14,000,000 of which was to be used for exercises scheduled for the Southwest Asia region. As a consequence of Operation Desert Shield, the Department, however, is reconsidering its plans for exercises in that region. The Committee strongly supports the JCS exercise program and fully funds the Army's request. But the Committee directs the Army to use funds budgeted for Southwest Asia exercises to finance other exercise requirements as necessary, until the Department resolves its plans for Southwest Asia. The Committee expects the Army to make funds available for Southwest Asia exercises once the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services have been informed of the Department's plans.

Panama claims.—The Committee directs the Secretary of the Army, through the Army Claims Service, to review the issue of wrongful death and injury claims arising out of Operation Just Cause and to determine whether or not there is legitimate grounds for compensation. A comprehensive report should be provided to the Committee, no later than April 15, 1992, outlining the arguments for and against paying wrongful death/injury claims in Panama and the facts supporting each position. The Army, in consultation with the Department of State, should present to the Committee, for its consideration, a specific remedy that will satisfy any legitimate wrongful death/injury and personal injury claims of Panamanian citizens.

The Committee is aware that under the Foreign Claims Act, 10 U.S.C. 2734(b)(3), the United States is prohibited from paying combat-related claims arising from American military action. The

Committee understands the purpose behind this act and does not recommend its repeal. Nor is the Committee suggesting that claims arising from property damage be considered at this time.

However, the Committee also is aware that following United States military action in Grenada, the State Department, through the Agency for International Development [AID], implemented a program to consider claims without regard to whether they were combat related. Through an interagency agreement, these funds were administered in Grenada by Army personnel over a period of 90 days. Approximately \$2,000,000 in AID funds was provided for payment of claims. The program made payment on 649 claims for a total of \$1,858,307. No funds appropriated to the Army were used to pay the claims.

The Committee is informed that the Grenada program was administered according to the general principle that an inhabitant who suffered loss, injury, or damage as a direct result of armed intervention by United States forces, which loss, injury, or damage was not attributed to that person's negligence or misconduct (including harboring the enemy), was considered a proper claimant.

The Committee is anxious for the issue of wrongful death and personal injury compensation resulting from Operation Just Cause be resolved quickly and justly. As the Panamanians work to rebuild their shattered country, the issue of compensation should not be allowed to cloud the close relationship with the United States.

Eau Clair weapons production facility.—The Committee recognizes the special circumstance surrounding the cleanup of the Eau Claire weapons production facility, in particular, the current impact ground water contamination is having on a nearby community. The Committee directs the Department of Defense to take immediate steps to clean-up hazardous waste contamination at the Eau Clair, weapons production facility in Wisconsin and that funds be used to expedite compliance with an EPA cleanup order. The Committee expects the process to be well underway by September 1992, or it will consider earmarking specific funds for that purpose in its fiscal year 1993 bill.

Air battle captain.—The Committee directs the Army to continue for fiscal year 1992 its demonstration program to place helicopter pilots graduated from the University of North Dakota in advanced helicopter pilot training.

Badger Army Ammunition Plant.—As it did last year, the Committee directs the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Environment) to give priority to the environmental cleanup of the Badger Ammunition Plant in Wisconsin. So far, progress remains slow. The Committee directs that the Secretary of Defense make \$840,000 immediately available for a study of the causes of contamination at Badger so that infrastructure remediation efforts can proceed as soon as possible.

The Committee recommends that funds be made available only for environmental remediation and restoration activities at the Badger Army Ammunition Plant. It is the Committee's intention that the Badger plant, currently in layaway status, be permanently closed. No funds shall be provided which in any way assist in the preparation of the plant for future production or are applied to ac-

tivities other than those connected with its disbanding and environmental cleanup.

The DASD(E) is to report back to the Committee, no later than February 1, 1992, on the Department's plans for addressing the remediation of the Badger plant's hazardous discharge this fiscal year.

Collateral war damage.—The Committee is pleased with the care taken by the military services during Operation Desert Storm to ensure that valuable cultural resources were not harmed. Their sensitivity to this concern was in sharp contrast to that of Iraq which systematically looted and destroyed Kuwait's national treasures and placed military equipment at the foot of ancient monuments, knowing that United States forces would not attack them.

The Committee believes that the conclusion of the war provides an opportunity for the United States to evaluate international policies and procedures regarding the protection of natural and cultural resources during times of war. The employment of more powerful area munitions and standoff weaponry should prompt a regular review of existing practices and international conventions on this issue. The Committee requests the Department of Defense, in conjunction with the Department of State, to convene a panel to consider this issue and to provide specific recommendations in a report to the Secretary of Defense, and the Committees on Appropriation of the Senate and the House, no later than August 15, 1992, on the ways in which collateral damage to natural and cultural resources resulting from military operations can continue to be minimized.

Military helicopter training and maintenance facility study.—The Committee is concerned that increasing flight restrictions imposed by the German Government may have a serious impact on the flight training and wartime readiness of United States Army and Marine Corps helicopter units operating in Europe.

The Committee believes that access to reliable, well-equipped training and maintenance facilities, particularly if located in environments similar to those which may be encountered in future conflicts, is essential to maintaining the fighting excellence of U.S. helicopter units.

The Committee directs that the Secretary of the Army make funds available to conduct a study, in conjunction with the RAND Corp., and in consultation with the United States Marine Corps, on the cost of upgrading existing helicopter facilities in Israel in order to establish joint United States Army/Marine helicopter training and support sites for United States units. The Committee believes the study is needed at a time when the military services are re-evaluating their training needs and are seeking to maximize their flexibility and readiness at minimum cost.

The study shall be provided to the Committee no later than June 15, 1992, and shall include, but not be limited to, a comprehensive examination and inventory of planning, design, architect and engineering services, threat simulation requirements, POL, maintenance and storage facilities, communication and air traffic control systems, and staging and training areas necessary to achieve this capability. The study shall also include the costs of acquisition, military construction, and installation of any equipment and facilities not provided by Israel.

Emergency barracks repairs.—The Army and the Bureau of Land Management jointly utilize three aging barracks at Fort Wainwright, AK. BLM occupies the barracks during the summer fire-fighting campaign, while the Army periodically uses the facilities during the winter training cycle. The Committee is aware of numerous health and safety repairs needed at these barracks, and expects \$250,000 be made available to accomplish these upgrades as rapidly as possible. The Committee understands that these buildings are located in a national historic landmark district. The Committee expects the Army to work with the appropriate historic preservation authorities to develop a comprehensive plan for the refurbishment and modernization of these barracks for use by the Army and BLM. The Committee hopes to address the more extensive repair projects for these facilities through either military construction or minor construction appropriations in fiscal year 1993.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

Appropriations, 1991	\$23,308,647,000
Budget estimate, 1992	23,934,200,000
House allowance	21,394,932,000
Committee recommendation	23,012,390,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$23,012,390,000. This is \$921,810,000 below the budget estimate and \$1,617,458,000 above the House allowance.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	House adjustments	Committee adjustments	Committee compared with House adjustments
Fiscal year 1992 budget request	23,934,200	23,934,200	
General purpose forces:			
Delayed decommissionings/operations		17,000	+ 17,000
Antarctic logistics		105,000	+ 105,000
Airlift and sealift: Sealift prepositioning	30,000		- 30,000
Central supply and maintenance:			
Naples quality of life	5,000		- 5,000
Servicewide transportation		- 19,800	- 19,800
Administration and associated activities:			
Naval Undersea Museum	2,100		- 2,100
ADP management	500		- 500
Model recycle center	210		- 210
Reproduction/printing		- 20,000	- 20,000
Naval Observatory		900	+ 900
DBOF adjustment	- 707,900	- 199,200	+ 508,700
Excess inventories	- 100,000		+ 100,000
Classified programs	- 99,793	- 81,900	+ 17,893
Department/command headquarters	- 149,000	- 11,000	+ 138,000
Travel	- 70,000	- 16,700	+ 53,300
RPM backlogs	330,000		- 330,000
Depot maintenance backlogs	600,000	250,000	- 350,000
Medical programs	- 2,432,735		+ 2,432,735
Foreign national employees	- 50,000		+ 50,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	House adjustments	Committee adjustments	Committee compared with House adjustments
Base closure contingency.....	- 50,000		+ 50,000
Reserve/Guard offset.....	- 10,000		+ 10,000
Benefits transfer from OSD.....	13,750		- 13,750
Transient lodging/billeting.....	- 20,000		+ 20,000
Meals-ready-to-eat.....	600		- 600
Spares and repair parts.....	168,000		- 168,000
Civilian personnel underexecution.....		- 39,923	- 39,923
Foreign currency repricing.....		- 50,800	- 50,800
Revolving fund excess cash.....		- 150,000	- 150,000
CIM/other ADP.....		- 70,487	- 70,487
Purchases inflation reestimate.....		- 53,500	- 53,500
Arms control.....		- 27,400	- 27,400
Finance activities.....		- 20,000	- 20,000
Transfer from DCA.....		- 270,000	- 270,000
Transfer-Maritime prepositioning.....		- 342,000	- 342,000
Shipyard modernization.....		78,000	+ 78,000
Total.....	21,394,932	23,012,390	+ 1,617,458

COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Ship depot maintenance.—The Committee recommendation increases Navy depot maintenance funding by \$250,000,000 for needed ship repairs and overhauls not funded in the President's budget request. Navy budget reductions and smaller force levels will result in significantly less repair work and a loss of skilled labor at both private and Navy shipyards in the future. The Navy's plans in 1992 call for much greater cuts to ship maintenance workload and personnel levels, compared to prior and future years. Providing funds for additional workload at both private and public yards in 1992 will allow for a more orderly and gradual transition to smaller shipyard work forces while preserving, to a reasonable extent, this critical industrial base. The additional funds are to be used for reducing overhaul backlogs and other ship maintenance in accordance with a plan submitted to the Committee by the Navy. In particular, that plan calls for the overhaul of two Atlantic fleet vessels; one of the overhauls—for DD-987—is to be awarded to a public yard and the other—for CG-47—is to be competed among public and private yards. The plan also calls for two Pacific fleet ships—DD-984 and DD-985—to be overhauled in 1992 instead of 1993.

Antarctic logistical support.—The Committee has added \$105,000,000 and has earmarked these funds only for the Navy's logistical and related support of the U.S. Antarctic program managed by the National Science Foundation. Of these funds, \$75,000,000 is to meet the President's request for personnel, air operations, surface transportation, Antarctic Continent operations, United States and New Zealand operations, and other items. The remaining \$30,000,000 meets the requirement for continuation of the safety, environmental, and health initiative. The Committee directs the Navy to use these funds consistent with the budget re-

quest and Presidential memorandum 6646 which designates the National Science Foundation with overall funding and management responsibility for U.S. activities in the Antarctic. The Committee further expects the Navy to coordinate its activities closely with the NSF to provide the support necessary to meet Antarctic program objectives.

Naval Observatory Earth orbit activities.—The Committee recommends adding funding of \$900,000 to support activities at the Naval Observatory in Green Bank, WV. Total funding in 1992 for these activities will now amount to \$1,600,000.

Delayed decommissionings.—The Committee adds \$17,000,000 to cover operating costs of the battleships *Missouri* and *Wisconsin* and the aircraft carrier *Midway*. Due to their extended stay in the Persian Gulf, these vessels will not be decommissioned by the end of fiscal year 1991, as assumed in the administration's budget request. The recommendation provides sufficient funding to allow for continued operations through the first 4 months of fiscal year 1992 while the ships are prepared for decommissioning.

Servicewide transportation.—Although the Navy plans to reduce military personnel by about 3 percent from 1991 to 1992 and equipment inventories by a similar amount, the service has requested a real, after inflation, increase in funding for servicewide transportation. The Committee denies the proposed increase in funding for this program, and reduces the budgeted level by \$19,800,000.

Printing.—One of the Department's Defense management review initiatives directs that all in-house printing activities be consolidated into one program and managed by the Navy. The Committee supports this consolidation but urges that it be done in a way which maximizes savings and adheres to the principles of economy and efficiency embodied in title 44, United States Code, and Public Law 101-520, section 206. To ensure that these requirements are met, the Committee directs the Department to:

- Rely, to the greatest extent possible, upon private sector printing contracts established through the Government Printing Office [GPO], since commercial procurement is usually far less expensive than in-house production.
- Close and/or realign a significant number of existing printing and duplicating facilities. By doing so, excess equipment should become available to those operations that remain open once the consolidation is completed. Therefore, the Committee denies funding of \$20,000,000 requested by the Navy to purchase additional printing equipment. The Navy should identify what equipment is available after consolidation before it purchases additional equipment. Moreover, the Department should equip and staff Department printing plants and duplicating operations that remain open to perform only the level of work that cannot be procured from the private sector through GPO.
- Adhere to current departmental practice when submitting requests and appropriate justification materials to the Joint Committee on Printing for approval of new equipment purchases.
- Send printing and duplicating jobs that will not be done in in-house facilities directly from the service initiating the job to the GPO. This will reduce administrative lead time and costs

associated with procuring printing services from commercial vendors.

- Adhere to the requirements of title 44, United States Code, and Public Law 101-520, section 206 when implementing the consolidation.

Photogrammetry.—The Committee disagrees with the House language decrying the Navy's efforts to establish in-house photogrammetry services. Cost data from actual jobs performed by both private contractors and naval shipyards demonstrate that it is cost-effective for naval shipyards to maintain in-house photogrammetry activities. The Committee encourages the Navy to continue and broaden the use of in-house photogrammetry techniques since it has proven to be an important cost-cutting measure.

Wastewater treatment at Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head.—The Committee encourages the Department of the Navy to proceed with its plan to fund, in fiscal year 1992, phase 2 of the wastewater treatment program at the Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, in southern Maryland. In 1987, a study by the State of Maryland showed that the station's current system for treating waste water produced by the research and development activities at the facility is inadequate and results in the discharge of nitrogen and phosphorus into the Potomac River. The Department of the Navy has recognized the seriousness of this problem and, at the urging of this Committee, proceeded with the construction of a new, \$6,400,000 waste water treatment plant. The Department should move expeditiously to complete construction and fully fund phase 2 of the project.

Fleet access and support study.—The Committee is concerned that destabilization in the Soviet Union, continuing turmoil in the Persian Gulf and the increasing military build-up of Syria, could necessitate a greater forward presence of U.S. Naval forces in the Middle East. In such circumstances, access to reliable, well-equipped port facilities will be a growing necessity. The Committee concurs with the assessment of many senior naval officers that the Port of Haifa provides the best, most cost-effective overhaul capability of any comparable facility in the region.

The Committee is recommending that \$2,000,000 be made available to the Secretary of the Navy to conduct a study on the cost of improving the Port of Haifa and its ship repair facilities in the immediate vicinity to accommodate the full complement of services required for the maintenance, repair and associated tasks needed to support a carrier battle group. The study is needed at a time when Congress and the military services are reevaluating just what our Nation's overseas access requirements will be in the foreseeable future.

The study shall include, but not be limited to, a detailed examination and inventory of planning, designing, architect and engineer services, dredging, POL, depot and storage facilities, distribution systems, pier and dock structures, communication systems, energy production facilities and administrative office requirements necessary to achieve this capability. The study shall also include the costs of acquisition, construction and installation of such equipment and facilities.

The study shall be provided to the Committee no later than July 1, 1992.

Pacific Fleet relocatable over-the-horizon radar [ROTHR].—The recent decision to terminate the Air Force over-the-horizon program leaves the Navy's ROTHR site at Amchitka as the only long-range radar site supporting Pacific Fleet operations in the North Pacific. The Committee recognizes the critical support provided by this facility, and understands that funding is provided in the Navy's budget request to maintain operations at the Amchitka ROTHR site through 1992. The Committee strongly supports this program, and expects that no reductions will be made to the operating funds for this site for 1992. The Committee expects the Navy's fiscal year 1993 budget request to reflect sufficient funding to maintain the operations of the Amchitka ROTHR site through 1993.

Bangor Submarine Base Recycling Program.—Recently, the naval submarine base in Bangor, WA, was recognized by the Environmental Protection Agency for having the best recycling program within the Federal Government. The Committee believes that this program offers an opportunity to demonstrate the operation of a comprehensive recycling center that can serve as a model for other Federal, as well as private sector, activities.

The Committee recommends that the Navy look into the feasibility of establishing a pilot comprehensive recycling center at the Bangor submarine base that is both affordable and reproducible at other installations across the country. The Secretary of the Navy should report back to the Committee on the Navy's findings no later than June 1, 1992.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

Appropriations, 1991	\$1,892,200,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,894,600,000
House allowance	2,082,500,000
Committee recommendation	2,109,665,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,109,665,000. This is \$215,065,000 above the budget estimate and \$27,165,000 above the House allowance.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

(In thousands of dollars)

Program	House adjustments	Committee adjustments	Committee compared with House adjustments
Fiscal year 1992 budget request	1,894,600	1,894,600	
General purpose forces:			
Support equipment		-2,064	-2,046
Field logistics		-2,366	-2,366
Base operations		-14,927	-14,927
Base communications		-1,132	-1,132

(In thousands of dollars)

Program	House adjustments	Committee adjustments	Committee compared with House adjustments
Central supply and maintenance:			
Supply operations.....		-3,309	-3,309
Second destination transportation.....		-1,155	-1,155
Administration and associated activities:			
ADP administration.....		-3,135	-3,135
Staff management support.....		-2,247	-2,247
DBOF adjustment.....	-43,600	-7,900	+35,700
RPM backlogs.....	70,000		-70,000
Depot maintenance backlogs.....	27,200		-27,200
Benefits transfer from OSD.....	4,100		-4,100
Meals-ready-to-eat.....	37,200		-37,200
Spares and repair parts.....	78,000		-78,000
Chemical equipment training.....	15,000		-15,000
Civilian personnel under-execution.....		-4,500	-4,500
Transfer from DCA.....		-75,000	-75,000
Foreign currency repricing.....		-5,000	-5,000
Purchases inflation reestimate.....		-4,200	-4,200
Maritime prepositioning transfer.....		342,000	+342,000
Total.....	2,082,500	2,109,665	+27,165

COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Support equipment.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$2,064,000 for land prepositioning, equipment, and supplies for training based upon a reduction in the number of battalion field training days from 7,131 in fiscal year 1991 to 5,285 in fiscal year 1992.

Base operations.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$14,927,000 for base operations support due to anticipated reductions in military construction projects and a requirement for a lower inventory of consumable items as Marine endstrength drops to 157,000 over the next several years. Specific reductions are directed in the following areas: \$752,000 for facilities engineering studies and funding to support studies and to develop documentation for the acquisition of needed facilities and services through private-sector financing arrangements; \$2,289,000 for administrative support to include maintenance of office equipment and consumable supplies; \$11,886 in miscellaneous base operating support to include consumable supplies, vehicle maintenance, and other base service support.

Supply operations.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$3,309,000 for supply operations which, under the current DMRD process, should have reduced the funding requirements for such activities as the receipt, storage, care-in-storage, inventory, issue, preservation, packaging, packing, and shipment of equipment and supplies, but have not. The Marine Corps fiscal year 1992 request for supply depot operations represents a 6.2-percent increase over fiscal year 1991 while all corresponding performance criteria (for example, workload) for this activity group shows a significant decline.

Second destination transportation.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$1,155,000 for second destination transportation and holds the Marine Corps to its fiscal year 1991 funding level. This reduction is based on Marine Corps performance criteria which show a projected decrease of 410 short tons for channel air cargo in fiscal year 1992 and no change in the amount of post exchange cargo, 16,000 tons, in fiscal year 1992.

Departmental administration.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$1,909,000 in headquarters funding for ADP systems and software as well as for increased square footage. Current DMRD initiatives consolidating ADP programs should have obviated the need for increases in software expenditure as well as continued growth in building space needed to support such systems.

Base communications.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$1,132,000 for base communications and holds the Marine Corps to the fiscal year 1991 appropriated level. An anticipated decline in end strength should reduce the need for the relocation or addition of leased telephone communications and upgrades to existing communication capacity.

Staff management support.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$2,247,000 for staff management support. The budget request is for a 46-percent increase in funding over the fiscal year 1990 level while work-years show a decline of approximately 8 percent during this same period.

Headquarters, other administration.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$1,226,000 for automated data processing hardware as well as funding for the establishment of the Western and Eastern Areas Counsel offices. Current DMRD initiatives consolidating ADP programs should have obviated the need for increases in software expenditure as well as continued growth in square footage and administrative support for such systems.

Field logistics support.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$2,366,000 for contracted advisory and assistance services [CAAS], ADP hardware costs, and the replenishment of publications. Performance criteria for field logistics support shows a diminished requirement for technical support and document preparation in fiscal year 1992.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

Appropriations, 1991	\$20,092,735,000
Budget estimate, 1992	20,342,900,000
House allowance	17,660,213,000
Committee recommendation	19,242,014,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$19,242,014,000. This is \$1,100,886,000 below the budget estimate and \$1,581,801,000 above the House allowance.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	House adjustments	Committee adjustments	Committee compared with House adjustments
Fiscal year 1992 budget request	20,342,900	20,342,900	
General purpose forces:			
Civil Air Patrol	1,380		- 1,380
Base operations		- 18,500	- 18,500
Central supply and maintenance:			
Spare parts pricing		- 73,000	- 73,000
Interim contractor support		- 13,800	- 13,800
Second destination transportation		- 25,000	- 25,000
Training and other personnel activities:			
Jr. ROTC	2,500	2,500	
Military family services	3,000		- 3,000
General increase	9,000		- 9,000
Flight training		- 2,300	- 2,300
Administration and associated activities:			
Civilian personnel	- 30,000		+ 30,000
Wartime host nation support	- 4,000		+ 4,000
CALS	27,000		- 27,000
DBOF adjustment	- 306,300	- 114,200	+ 192,100
Excess inventories	- 140,000		+ 140,000
Classified programs	- 198,482	- 233,700	- 35,218
Department/command headquarters	- 39,600	- 22,800	+ 16,800
Travel	- 51,800	- 39,000	+ 12,800
RPM backlogs	150,000		- 150,000
Depot maintenance backlogs	136,000		- 136,000
Medical programs	- 2,252,635		+ 2,252,635
Foreign national employees	- 30,000		+ 30,000
Base closure contingency	- 59,000		+ 59,000
Benefits transfer from OSD	16,750		- 16,750
Transient lodging/billeting	- 19,000		+ 19,000
Meals-ready-to-eat	2,500		- 2,500
Spares and repair parts	100,000		- 100,000
Civilian personnel under-execution		- 112,200	- 112,200
Foreign currency repricing		- 179,200	- 179,200
Revolving fund excess cash		- 100,000	- 100,000
CIM/other ADP		- 101,786	- 101,786
Purchases inflation reestimate		- 45,500	- 45,500
Arms control		- 2,400	- 2,400
Finance activities		- 20,000	- 20,000
Total	17,660,213	19,242,014	+ 1,581,801

COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Second destination transportation.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$25,000,000 for Air Force second destination transportation. The Air Force Logistics Command [AFLC] officials reported to GAO that funding for second destination transportation has been historically less than the amount projected in the President's budget. Air Force officials stated there was no significant impact in the past as a result of previous unfunded requirements. The Air Force Logistics Command also suggested 1992 costs for this program may be less than originally projected because of fewer requirements for transporting air munitions due to the gulf war.

Base operations.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$18,500,000 for base operating support. A comparison of Air Force

base operating support personnel endstrengths between 1990 and 1992 shows that the average number of civilian and military personnel is increasing from 956 personnel per base in 1990 to 965 personnel per base in 1992. The recommendation proposes reducing average personnel per base to the 1990 level in light of planned force structure reductions and makes the appropriate funding adjustments.

Stock fund consumables.—The Committee is concerned by a recent GAO report (NSIAD-91-201, July 1991), that concluded that Air Force policy and procedure governing the requirement computation process for aircraft consumable items has resulted in duplication of requirements for back-ordered items. The GAO noted that the Air Force excluded applicable depot maintenance assets in deciding to buy or cancel items already on order. By eliminating the duplication and considering all applicable assets in computing requirements, GAO estimated that the Air Force could reduce fiscal year 1992 procurement by as much as \$159,000,000.

The Committee expects the Air Force to make swift changes to its policies and procedures in the way it manages stock fund consumables and that these changes will be reflected in its fiscal year 1993 budget submission. The Committee is not taking what it believes to be a legitimate reduction of \$159,000,000 for stock fund purchases of consumable items in the expectation that these changes will be made. The Committee directs the GAO to continue to monitor this situation and to report, no later than June 1, 1992, on the progress made by the Air Force in resolving this problem.

Interim contractor support.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$13,800,000 for interim contractor support [ICS] of which not less than \$13,000,000 shall be deducted from the amount requested for the C-17 program. The Air Force recently negotiated a new delivery schedule for the C-17 program. The revised schedule shows there will be a 3- to 12-month delay in the delivery of production aircraft with the delivery date for the first aircraft requiring interim contractor support slipping 8 months to October 1992. Additionally, while the request for ICS funding for fiscal year 1992 is based on supporting 11 aircraft, the first production aircraft requiring this support will not be delivered until fiscal year 1993. According to GAO, the \$23,800,000 requested by the Air Force in fiscal year 1992 for ICS for the C-17 appears overstated by at least \$13,800,000. According to AFLC officials, most of the fiscal year 1992 C-17 ICS funds are for long lead expense items.

Reliability-centered maintenance.—The Committee believes the Air Force should move more vigorously to implement a strict reliability-centered maintenance [RCM] program for all its aircraft. The Committee has identified a potential reduction of \$76,800,000 to the "Air Force depot maintenance" account had Air Force directives on RCM been fully adhered to.

The Committee notes that between fiscal year 1988 and fiscal year 1989, Air Force Logistics Command [AFLC] extended the time intervals for programmed depot maintenance on the C-5, C-9, C-130, and C-141 aircraft from 48 to 60 months after deciding that the time period between scheduled maintenance could be lengthened without degrading safety or operability. According to a recent GAO analysis, during this period, the Air Force maintained overall

readiness levels; its mission capable rates remained high, and aircraft were not grounded due to a failure to perform scheduled depot maintenance.

An audit report prepared by the DOD Office of the Inspector General (91-098, June 17, 1991), finds that the Air Force could save \$76,800,000 annually (\$461,000,000 over the 6-year future years defense program), by implementing reliability-centered maintenance analyses for all aviation systems receiving depot-level maintenance. DOD Directive 4151.16, "DOD Equipment Maintenance Program," paragraph 3.a., states that reliability-centered maintenance shall be the basis for establishing and sustaining preventative maintenance programs for all DOD equipment. According to DOD auditors, "Although internal control procedures existed to provide for compliance with the requirements of DOD Directive 4151.16 and Air Force Logistics Command Regulation 66-35 to implement and sustain reliability-centered maintenance analyses, their enforcement has been ineffective because of a lack of emphasis by Air Force Logistics Command Headquarters."

The Committee is not taking a \$76,800,000 reduction to depot maintenance in the expectation that the Air Force will move expeditiously to implement a comprehensive RCM program in fiscal year 1992. The Committee recognizes the start which the Air Force has made in this area, but believes that much more can be done to reduce repair costs without jeopardizing safety or impairing readiness. The Committee directs that the anticipated cost savings from RCM be reflected in the fiscal year 1993 budget request.

The Committee also directs the General Accounting Office to report, no later than June 30, 1992, on the progress made by the Air Force in fully implementing its reliability-centered maintenance procedures. GAO should also perform an analysis of cost-savings data provided by the Air Force in its fiscal year 1993 budget.

Tonopah closure.—The Committee believes the Air Force, in its fiscal year 1992 budget submission, failed to adequately account for the savings it expects to realize from the movement of the 37th Tactical Fighter Wing (TFW) from Tonopah to Test Range Air Field, NE, to Holloman AFB, NM. The Committee believes it would be justified in reducing the Air Force "Operation and maintenance" account by \$82,745,000, but is declining to do so in an effort to ease the pressure on the overall "Operation and maintenance" account.

The Committee notes that DOD concurred with a GAO finding that savings of \$93,000,000 would result from costs that are unique to Tonopah and will not transfer with the 37th TFW when it moves to Holloman AFB, NM. These costs include: \$74,057,000 for Tonopah base contracts, and \$22,000,000 in personnel costs for 706 military slots eliminated when the 37th TFW moves and \$4,500,000 in enlisted separation pay. A cost of \$7,500,000 will be incurred by the Air Force to maintain Tonopah in caretaker status. The overall savings associated with the closure of Tonopah is estimated at \$93,257,000. The Air Force estimates relocation costs for the 37th TFW at Holloman at \$10,512,000, leaving an overall net saving for the entire move of at least \$82,745,000 annually. None of these savings were accounted for in the Air Force request.

The Committee expects that in the future, the Air Force will do a better job in identifying savings from closed installations in its annual budget submissions.

Flight training.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$2,300,000 in funding for travel in the "Air Force training" account. The Air Force is in the process of procuring and fielding basic aptitude testers [BAT's] to be deployed in numerous testing facilities to screen applicants for flight training. The fielding of BAT's should result in lower flight training dropout rates and lessen travel requirements of applicants to testing sites through wide dissemination of this system. The Air Force does not reflect any travel reductions as a result of fielding this system.

SPARE PARTS PRICING

The Committee recommends a reduction of \$73,000,000 in spare parts funding for specific items identified by GAO. An ongoing GAO review of Air Force budget development process identified specific spare parts where the contract price was lower than the budgeted price, a purchase requirement was reduced or eliminated by the item manager, or excess inventory already existed. Funding for the following items is denied by the Committee:

Radar system computer:	
Price error	\$18,900,000
Quantity error	7,000,000
Brake assemblies.....	6,000,000
Braking mechanisms (F-16).....	10,700,000
Braking mechanisms (C-5B).....	2,300,000
Traveling wave tubes.....	3,800,000
Compression case assemblies.....	2,500,000
External nozzle segment assemblies	3,500,000
Augmenter liners:	
Price error	7,400,000
Quantity error	400,000
Radar warning receivers	2,000,000
Fourth stage blades	2,000,000
Divergent flaps.....	1,200,000
Signal processors.....	5,200,000
Total.....	73,000,000

Total does not add due to rounding.

F-16 air pilot guidance radar system computers.—The fiscal year 1992 budget included 96 air pilot guidance radar system computers used on F-16 aircraft at a forecasted unit price of \$465,773. The budget requirement for this item had an estimated price of \$465,773. The Air Force recently negotiated a contract price of \$268,620, or a difference of \$197,153 per item. This represents a fiscal year 1992 potential savings of \$18,926,688. In addition, the Air Force did not apply 26 of its on-order assets to its projected fiscal year 1992 requirements. The application of the 26 to the fiscal year 1992 requirements could result in a further budget reduction of \$6,984,120.

Brake assemblies.—The fiscal year 1992 budget includes 132 brake assemblies for the B-1. This item has a forecasted unit price of \$45,135 for a total cost of \$5,957,952. Due to a reduction in requirements, the Air Force has sufficient brake assemblies on hand to satisfy its fiscal year 1992 requirement. Therefore, the budget

could be reduced by \$5,957,952. This reduction will not have any adverse effect on the Air Force's mission.

Braking mechanisms (F-16).—The fiscal year 1992 budget includes 1,433 braking mechanisms for the F-16 landing gear at the forecasted unit price of \$7,500. The Air Force has sufficient component parts in inventory to assemble the 1,433 items. The Air Force currently is assembling these items at a cost of \$50 each. Therefore, the budget can be reduced by \$10,747,500.

Braking mechanisms (C-5B).—The fiscal year 1992 budget includes 194 braking mechanisms for the C-5B landing gear. This item has a forecasted unit price of \$11,802 for a total cost of approximately \$2,300,000. The Air Force already has purchased a sufficient quantity of items to satisfy its fiscal year 1992 requirement. Therefore, the budget can be reduced by \$2,289,588 without any adverse effect on the Air Force's mission.

Traveling wave tubes.—The Air Force no longer plans to buy the current version of the traveling wave tube used on the F-15 radar. This item has a forecasted unit price of \$125,892. The Air Force excluded the item from its current year requirements, but included 30 items in its fiscal year 1992 requirements. The fiscal year 1992 budget can be reduced by \$3,776,760.

Compression case assemblies.—Based upon a GAO review of available documentation, the Air Force erroneously excluded 56 compression case assemblies for the F-111 aircraft in computing its fiscal year 1992 budget request. Each item has a forecasted unit price of \$91,621. The budget request shows a need for 27 items. If the 56 items had been considered, the budget request would have been zero. Therefore, the budget can be reduced by \$2,473,767.

External nozzle segment assemblies.—The Air Force erroneously recorded 2,354 external nozzle segment assemblies for the F-100/200-220 engine as inventory losses. These items were not losses and should have been considered by the Air Force in determining its requirements. Since these items are available for use, and have a forecasted unit price of \$1,507, the Air Force's fiscal year 1992 budget request can be reduced by \$3,547,478.

Augmenter liners.—The fiscal year 1992 budget includes 392 augmenter liners for the F-100 engine at a forecast unit price of \$27,648. The Air Force recently negotiated a contract price of \$8,850 per item for a difference of \$18,798. This represents a potential savings of \$7,368,816. In addition, the Air Force understated available assets by 48 liners when computing its requirements leading to a further funding reduction of \$424,800. Total budget savings, \$7,793,616.

Radar warning receivers.—The fiscal year 1992 budget includes eight radar warning receivers at a forecasted unit price of \$254,334. This item is part of the electronic countermeasure system used on the F-15. The Air Force failed to consider 19 available assets when determining its fiscal year 1992 requirements. If these items had been considered, the budget request would have been zero. Therefore, the budget can be reduced by \$2,024,672.

Fourth stage blades.—The fiscal year 1992 budget includes 22,004 fourth stage blades for the F-100 engine at a forecast unit price of \$187 for a total cost of \$4,114,748. The Air Force understated available blades by 10,704 when computing its budget requirement. The

application of the 10,704 blades to the fiscal year 1992 request results in a budget reduction of \$2,004,645.

Divergent flaps.—The fiscal year 1992 budget includes 1,825 divergent flaps used on the F-110 engine. This item has a forecasted unit price of \$2,914. However, the Air Force did not consider 417 items received as a warrantee settlement from the manufacturer. Therefore, the budget can be reduced by \$1,215,138.

Signal processors.—The fiscal year 1992 budget includes 23 signal processors used on the F-117 and B-2 aircraft at an estimated unit price of \$254,244. However, the current unit price is \$26,000 or a difference of \$288,244 per item. Therefore, the budget can be reduced by \$5,249,152.

OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

Price changes and annual budgeting.—As part of its continuing effort to improve the financial management control over the Defense Department's billion-dollar inventory, the Committee, in conjunction with the General Accounting Office [GAO], is reviewing the accuracy and reliability of the data used by the Air Force to develop its fiscal year 1992 baseline budget for repairable items. In discussions with GAO, the Committee has learned that the Department does not have a mechanism in place to adjust for price changes, either increases or decreases, once the budget is developed and locked in place. For example, prices used to develop the fiscal year 1992 budget were based on price data as of September 1990.

GAO has identified millions of dollars of savings that can accrue to the Government through the use of more accurate pricing data. For instance, GAO found that in the fiscal year 1992 budget the Air Force requested 96 items with a forecasted unit price of \$465,773. Subsequently, the Air force negotiated a new contract at a unit price of \$268,620 or a difference of \$197,153 per item. As a result, the actual funding needed to procure these items is \$18,926,688, less than the amount requested. The Department is not aware of the overall impact such price changes have on the budget.

As a result, the Committee is not being provided the accurate and reliable information it needs to make budgetary decisions. In some instances, too much funding is being requested. In other cases, because of a price increase, insufficient funding is being requested to procure the needed items. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the Department to develop the means to ascertain the impact of such price changes and provide this information to the Committee for their use during budgetary deliberations.

The problems identified by the Committee and GAO are not new. Persistent discrepancies in the price data provided in the Department's annual budget submission seriously distort the Committee's review process. Effective with the fiscal year 1993 budget, the Secretary of Defense is directed to provide the Committee with a report that indicates all those instances in which the current contract price differs from the contract price used in developing the budget estimate by more or less than 8 percent. The report should identify the specific item, the price increase or decrease per item, and the total dollar impact upon the budget. A separate report

should be submitted for the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Defense agencies. The reports should be based on information as of March 1 and are due to the Committee no later than March 31, 1992.

Carbon dioxide pellet blasting.—The Committee commends the Air Force and its personnel at Warner-Robins Air Logistics Center for their pioneering work with the carbon dioxide pellet blasting process. This innovative approach to the problem of paint removal will go a long way toward reducing the environmental contamination, and mitigating the health and safety hazards, associated with aircraft and vehicle corrosion maintenance.

The Committee recognizes that paint stripping is an integral part of the maintenance of most major military equipment. Standard chemical strippers and detergent cleaners pose a serious disposal problem, leading to mounting costs and the potential of deferred maintenance. Prolonged exposure to solvents can have a detrimental effect on worker health, resulting in degraded performance and lost workdays.

The Committee strongly believes that each of the services should carefully investigate emerging technologies which may contribute to reduced on-the-job hazards and provide budgetary savings. The following table provides Air Force projections on the cost savings per aircraft of paint stripping including waste disposal:

Aircraft	Chemical	CO ₂ /flashlamp	Savings
F-15.....	\$49,660	\$7,527	\$42,133
C-130.....	67,851	20,547	47,303
C-141.....	100,000	41,095	59,125

The Committee directs that the Air Force accelerate its development and fielding of its Carbon Dioxide Pellet Blasting Program and that the performance data gained from its testing program be fully shared with the other services and defense agencies. Each service secretary as well as heads of the Defense agencies is directed to report back to the Committee no later than June 1, 1992, on the steps being taken to reduce the environmental waste contamination and safety hazards connected with paint removal and general cleaning operations. The reports should include the specific steps taken to work with the Air Force in the development of the CO₂ process or its testing for possible future use at the component level.

Printing and reproduction.—The Committee remains concerned that the Air Force continues to rely heavily on in-house printing and reproduction when much of this function could be carried out through outside contracting. Last year, the Committee expressed its concern at the scope of Air Force printing operations and directed that three installations be closed by September 30, 1991. In April, pursuant to a Committee request, the Air Force reported that DOD had instituted a planned consolidation of servicewide printing operations under an industrially funded defense printing service. The Committee will be reviewing the progress made by the Air Force, as well as the other services and defense agencies, to reduce their printing costs and expects that savings will be reflected in the fiscal year 1993 budget submission.

Base maintenance contracts.—The Department of State must actively negotiate favorable burdensharing agreements for the Department of Defense in providing for the defense of host nations and to accommodate the orderly management of the drawdown of U.S. forces overseas. While progress has been made in Korea and Japan, little progress has been made in European/NATO countries.

Of particular concern is the cost escalation of base maintenance contracts, where collective labor agreements have often shown significant cost growth beyond the rate of inflation. Existing agreements do not address burdensharing and give little flexibility to the services for alternative labor arrangements, that is, using military, dependent hires, et cetera, to meet mission/support requirements. The Committee recognizes that in the near term, the services cannot adequately budget for the increases imposed by some nations, making the execution of near-term bills increasingly difficult. The Air Force estimates that the total cost of base maintenance contracts in USAFE will rise from \$185,300,000 in fiscal year 1991 to \$3,872,400,000 by fiscal year 1997.

CIVIL AIR PATROL

The Committee remains committed to a well-funded, well-supported Civil Air Patrol [CAP] and expects the Air Force to fulfill prior Committee directives toward that end. In doing so, the Air Force shall ensure that the full \$21,427,000 recommended by the Committee is made available to the CAP in fiscal year 1992.

The Civil Air Patrol is an Air Force program funding a private, nonprofit corporation and Air Force support personnel who operate in a dual parallel command structure. Air Force operation and maintenance funding provides for the administration of the program and supports corporate operations. The CAP mission which is to assist the USAF in providing emergency services capability throughout the continental United States. CAP also supports the U.S. Customs Service and the Drug Enforcement Agency [DEA] in its surveillance and detection of illegal drug activities. Funding of \$1,000,000 is provided to CAP through the counternarcotics budget for that purpose.

The Committee includes report language under drug interdiction and counterdrug activities, defense, which waives reimbursement to the Air Force or the Department of Defense for CAP counternarcotics activities on behalf of Federal, State, or local agencies.

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation
CAP—USAF:			
Military personnel.....	9,351	9,351	9,351
Mission support (O&M).....	3,402	3,402	3,402
Subtotal.....	12,753	12,753	12,753
CAP—Operations:			
SAR/DR.....	1,750	2,200	2,200
Vehicle/equipment main.....	100	400	400
A/C maintenance.....	750	1,300	1,300

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Uniforms.....	200	200	200
Cadet exchange.....	220	300	300
Subtotal, O&M.....	3,020	4,400	4,400
Aircraft.....	1,974	1,974	1,974
Vehicles.....		+ 800	+ 800
Communications.....		+ 500	+ 500
Subtotal, procurement.....	1,974	3,274	3,274
Counternarcotics.....	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total:			
CAP—USAF.....	12,753	12,753	12,753
CAP—Operations.....	5,994	8,674	8,674
Total.....	18,747	21,427	21,427

JP-4 to JP-8 fuel conversion.—The Committee believes the Air Force should move expeditiously to convert its remaining aircraft using JP-4 fuel to JP-8 and should set a target date, a plan, and a timetable for full conversion. The Committee understands that Air Force operations in Conus and WESTPAC are the principal areas not yet scheduled for conversion to JP-8.

JP-8 is a kerosene-based jet fuel with a higher flash point than the naphtha-based JP-4 which is more volatile and so not as safe to use. According to the Air Force, studies indicate that the use of JP-8 can reduce gunfire-induced ignitions by 31 percent and post-crash fires by 12 percent. In addition, JP-8 has the advantage that it can replace diesel fuel for ground equipment, simplifying battlefield logistics and giving greater flexibility to commanders in the distribution of fuels. Local variations on JP-8 fuel are also the standard among most of our NATO and major non-NATO allies.

While the Committee is aware that some local suppliers are likely to be affected by an Air Force decision to change fuels, the change is nonetheless warranted by the need to improve safety and to standardize DOD operational planning along the single fuel on the battlefield concept. The Committee believes that any increase in cost to the Air Force that might result from a JP-4 to JP-8 conversion should be offset, over time, by greater supplier competition.

The Committee strongly supports the conversion of Air Force aircraft, where practicable, to a common fuel; it is an initiative which would bring Air Force Conus-based aircraft into line with those in Europe which use JP-8.

Launch operations.—Both Air Force and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] polar-orbiting weather satellites are launched by the Air Force at Vandenberg, AFB, CA. Contract management is conducted by the Air Force and one-half the costs are provided by NOAA on a reimbursable basis. However, the fiscal year 1992 budget proposes to shift all costs to NOAA for the Atlas launch facility.

The Committee's review of payload schedules and launch requirements indicates that the Atlas facility operations should con-

tinue to be shared by the Air Force and NOAA as has been the practice in past years. Therefore, the Committee directs that the Air Force provide \$16,000,000 of operation and maintenance appropriations toward operating the Atlas launch facility and to assume reimbursements from NOAA of an equal amount.

Junior ROTC.—The Committee has provided an additional \$2,500,000 for Air Force Junior ROTC to allow continuing this program at the fiscal year 1991 level.

Fairchild Air Force Base/Cheney School District.—Cheney School District, near Spokane, WA, serves military personnel and their dependents at Fairchild Air Force Base. The school district and the State of Washington have consistently supported the educational needs of children of military families. However, Windsor Elementary, the primary facility serving these children, is inadequate to provide them a decent educational environment.

Particularly acute is the problem for special education students. Fairchild has been designated as a preferred assignment for Air Force children with handicaps. Space is inadequate to meet physical and occupational therapy demands as required by law.

The Committee directs the Department to initiate discussions with the Cheney School District concerning renovation of this facility to accommodate the educational needs of military special needs children, together with other military elementary school-age dependents. The project should be coordinated with the Cheney School District and the State of Washington.

Minuteman III consolidation.—Section 1139 of S. 1507, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992-93, as passed by the Senate, specifies limitations relating to the deployment of the Minuteman III ICBM force. This provision was developed in response to the Air Force plan to consolidate Minuteman III forces from four to three wings. This proposed transfer was not discussed by Air Force officials in congressional hearings on the Minuteman II retirement program, and was announced before consultation with congressional oversight committees.

The Committee is concerned that this consolidation plan is premature, preempts congressional oversight responsibilities, and needs to be evaluated in the broader context of overall force restructuring. The Committee supports the authorization provision and understands that the provision will be addressed in the Armed Services' conference. The Air Force is directed to keep this Committee fully informed on this issue in the future.

Theater Air Command Control and Simulation Facility.—The Committee understands that there is some uncertainty over the future of Theater Air Command Control and Simulation Facility [TACCSF] at Kirtland Air Force Base. The Committee strongly recommends that the Air Force maintain and operate TACCSF through fiscal year 1992. TACCSF's capabilities may well be required in the near future to assist in requirement definition and integration of new theater missile defense systems. The Committee notes that a report is being directed to address alternatives to the current operation of the testbed which would allow the facility to be funded and fully utilized by interested services, defense agencies, and other Federal agencies.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE AGENCIES

Appropriations, 1991	\$8,498,957,000
Budget estimate, 1992	8,794,800,000
House allowance	18,599,037,000
Committee recommendation	8,635,768,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$8,635,768,000. This is \$159,032,000 below the President's budget and \$9,963,269,000 below the House allowance.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	House - adjustments	Committee adjustments	Committee compared with House adjustments
Fiscal year 1992 budget request	8,794,800	8,794,800	
Washington headquarters service	- 10,000	- 10,552	- 552
Office of Economic Adjustment		4,000	+ 4,000
Defense Mapping Agency		- 2,538	- 2,538
Defense legal services		- 632	- 632
On-site Inspection Agency		- 35,300	- 35,300
The Joint Chiefs of Staff		- 15,825	- 15,825
Coordinated Health Care Agency	8,095,584		- 8,095,584
Defense Commissary Agency	980,100		- 980,100
Defense Contract Audit Agency	2,500		- 2,500
Defense finance and accounting	557,400		- 557,400
Defense Investigative Service	10,000		- 10,000
Defense Logistics Agency	2,000	6,800	+ 4,800
Defense medical support activity	- 10,000		+ 10,000
Federal Health Care Agency	3,000		- 3,000
Military Family Resource Center	- 5,000		+ 5,000
Office of Secretary of Defense	- 74,800		+ 74,800
Uniformed Services University of Health Science	- 5,000		+ 5,000
Joint Recruiting Advertising Program	- 10,456	- 3,000	+ 7,456
U.S. Special Operations Command	42,000	42,300	+ 300
OCHAMPUS		20,000	+ 20,000
Classified programs	259,209	202,500	- 56,709
Civilian personnel		- 53,500	- 53,500
DBOF adjustment	- 300	- 100	+ 200
Foreign currency		- 51,400	- 51,400
Corporate information management		- 223,085	- 223,085
Purchases inflation		- 19,700	- 19,700
Revolving fund cash		- 50,000	- 50,000
Legacy Resource Program		15,000	+ 15,000
Excess inventories	- 25,000		+ 25,000
Foreign national employees	- 12,000		+ 12,000
Radiation exposure compensation claims	5,000	15,000	+ 10,000
Gainsharing		1,000	+ 1,000
Total	18,599,037	8,635,768	- 9,963,269

COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Washington headquarters service.—The Defense Agency budget request includes \$21,614,000 for program increases to support new program initiatives and increased personnel. A number of these

proposed programs are duplicative of ongoing efforts within the military components. Additionally, a planned transfer of civilian personnel from OSD did not occur. Therefore, the Committee recommends a reduction of \$10,552,000.

Office of Economic Adjustment.—The Office of Economic Adjustment submitted a budget request of \$4,913,000 in order for DOD to support communities affected by the downsizing of the Defense Establishment. Recently, the downsizing has taken on a prodigious pace, yet funding for OEA has not grown commensurately. The Committee is concerned that DOD is not taking a more aggressive approach in providing communities with assistance. Therefore, the Committee recommends an increase of \$2,500,000 to provide for additional community planning grants, increased staffing levels, and the opening of a western regional office. The Committee also directs that up to \$100,000 of the total amount authorized for OEA in fiscal year 1992 may be used for planning DOD support for special events.

Charleston Harbor management plan.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$500,000 for the Office of Economic Adjustment to assist with the Charleston Harbor, SC, Estuary special area management plan. The South Carolina Coastal Council and the Department of Commerce presently are developing a special area management plan for the Charleston Harbor Estuary. The comprehensive plan developed through the project will provide specific management measures for the harbor that can be incorporated into the South Carolina Coastal Council's federally approved coastal management plan. It will help govern future growth and waterfront development at this important commercial harbor and defense site.

While the Department of Defense has a significant presence in Charleston and on the Cooper River, it has not taken part in, or contributed to, this very important intergovernmental planning effort. Further, one of the study's specific objectives is to identify dredge disposal methods and 20 percent of the dredging in Charleston Harbor directly supports the Navy mission. The Committee believes that it is important to ensure that development of the harbor is conducted in a manner that is compatible with the long-term development plans of the Navy.

In light of the OEA's experience in joint land use planning around military installations, that Office is the appropriate mechanism for coordinating the Department's cooperation with this effort. This should be done in accord and coordination with existing Federal support on this plan.

Impact assistance for Nye County, NV.—The Committee directs that for fiscal year 1992, the Secretary of Defense provide direct grant assistance of \$1,000,000 to Nye County, NV, from the Office of Economic Adjustment account, for impact assistance relating to the capital improvements made by the county to accommodate the dependents of members of the Armed Forces, Department of Defense contractor personnel, and the Department of Energy employees supporting the Tonopah Test Center.

Defense Mapping Agency.—In preparing their budget estimates for fiscal year 1992, the Defense Mapping Agency used the wrong average salary figure for their civilian personnel projections. DMA

shows a decreases of 96 workyears priced at an average salary of \$19,135 per year, when in reality the average salary is \$46,617. Therefore, the Committee recommends a decrease of \$2,538,000 in order to correct this error.

Defense Legal Service Agency.—The Defense Legal Service Agency submitted a budget request of \$7,053,000. However, in preparing an historical analysis of DLSA's obligations, the Committee notes that DLSA has consistently not spent all the moneys appropriated to them. Therefore, the Committee recommends a decrease of \$632,000.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff.—The Joint Chiefs of Staff submitted a budget request of \$261,139,000 for the JCS exercises program. However, the Committee notes that the JCS exercise program has historically not spent all the moneys appropriated to it. Therefore, the Committee recommends a decrease of \$15,825,000.

Ready Reserve Fleet.—The Ready Reserve Fleet is a fleet of ships set aside by the Nation in a caretaker status to be used in the event of a national emergency or crisis. During Desert Storm/Shield, some of the ships were called to action. Many were unable to respond due to the poor condition in which they were kept. The Committee is concerned that a valuable national asset is being lost through the lack of a creative and robust maintenance program. The Committee believes that periodically bringing a few ships out of their caretaker status and utilizing them in a training exercise would alleviate any doubts as to their ability to respond when needed. The JCS exercise program appears to be a ready-made vehicle for this. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Department study the use of RRF ships as an integral part of the JCS exercise program.

Chemical protective gloves.—In the early 1980's, the Defense Logistics Agency [DLA] recognized that the sole-source producer of chemical protective gloves was having difficulty meeting contractual delivery schedules, was incapable of providing any surge requirements, and was receiving a premium price for its products.

DLA established a second source for chemical gloves in 1981; this was done under DLA's exception 16 statutory provision for establishing an industrial mobilization base. The result has been competitive procurements resulting in the price of gloves declining from a 1979 sole-source price of close to \$10 per pair to the Government currently paying around \$6 per pair.

The gulf war resulted in both contractors being required to go to around-the-clock, 7 day-a-week operations to meet the added requirements of Desert Storm. In Secretary of Defense Cheney's report to Congress on the gulf conflict, he made the following two observations: Consumption of chemical protective clothing exceeded expectations causing a drawdown of worldwide theater war reserve stocks. In-theater distribution of bulky, high demand items (such as chemical protective clothing) required intensive supply management to satisfy requirements. Also, the industrial base for consumable chemical defense items was hard pressed to keep pace with the drawdown of war reserve stocks. As a result of experience in SWA, stockage levels and resupply procedures are being reconsidered for high demand items of chemical defense equipment.

And in reference to DLA's role in the war: There were shortcomings in the agency's contribution to the gulf war. Notably, the industrial base was strained to meet requirements, even though these requirements were for a regional conflict rather than the global war we had planned for during the gulf war. As the number of contractors during peacetime is reduced, there is a declining ability to produce adequate quantities of critical items. For example, the producers of nerve agent antidotes and chemical protective gloves already had declined to two producers each. For these items, procurements were coming to an end and new requirements had not been identified. The industrial base for these and several other items would have been greatly diminished if Operation Desert Shield had commenced 6 months later. The agency notes the continuing requirement to balance our war reserve programs with a realistic assessment of industrial base capability.

The above findings obviously have had no effect on military planners as DLA has informed the two suppliers that there are no planned procurements of protective gloves in fiscal year 1992. It appears that both suppliers will shortly finish production on their current contracts and start to shut down operations. The second source has already begun layoffs and plans for plant closure.

Desert Storm illustrated the potential threat posed by chemical weapons. Without any agreement for a verifiable ban on chemical weapons, it is important that the mobilization base for chemical protective gloves be maintained.

Based upon the Secretary of Defense's interim report on the gulf war, there is a recognized need for maintaining the mobilization base for chemical protective gloves. The Committee directs that the Defense Logistic Agency submit a plan to the Committee's on Appropriations and Armed Services on how the Department plans to retain this capability in the future.

Radiation exposure trust fund.—The Committee recommends an addition of \$15,000,000 to O&M, Defense Agencies to be transferred to the radiation exposure trust fund. These funds will be used to pay the claims of victims who suffered from radiation exposure at Government-sponsored test sites and uranium mines. Section 8114 has been included to facilitate this transfer.

In its bill, the House added \$5,000,000 for transfer to the radiation exposure trust fund but prohibited using the funds to cover costs of legal representatives retained by the claimants. The Committee disagrees with the House prohibition. The House language will only serve to harm claimants who need assistance in the adjudication process and cannot otherwise afford representation. Accordingly, the Committee strikes the House provision barring payment for legal representation.

HAWAII DEFENSE LANDS INVENTORY

On July 7, 1898, Congress formally annexed Hawaii to the United States. All public lands, harbors, and other properties of the Republic of Hawaii, approximately 1,800,000 acres, were ceded to the United States upon annexation.

On April 30, 1900, Congress passed the Organic Act which set up the government of the Territory of Hawaii. Although legal title to

the public lands in Hawaii was vested in the United States, the territory was given administrative control and use of the lands. The United States reserved the right to set aside lands by Executive order for use by the U.S. Government. Some lands, although not formally set aside were used by the United States through permits, licenses or with the permission of the territorial government.

The Organic Act also allowed the United States to convey legal title to the territory for portions of ceded lands that might be used by the territory for certain specified public purposes. Additionally, the territory and the U.S. Government acquired fee simple title to private lands through cash purchases, condemnation, and gifts. Some of the lands acquired by the territory in this manner were set aside by Executive orders for use by the U.S. Government. On July 9, 1921, Congress passed the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act affirming its obligations to native Hawaiians by placing over 200,000 acres, with certain exclusions, of public land in trust to assist in the rehabilitation of native Hawaiians.

Hawaii formally became a State on August 21, 1959, through the passage by Congress of the Admission Act. Section 5 of the Admission Act addressed the issue of government lands in Hawaii. The State of Hawaii received title to approximately 1,200,000 acres of land. The U.S. Government retained title to those ceded lands and territorial lands that were formally set aside by Presidential and gubernatorial Executive orders for use by the U.S. Government. Additionally, the U.S. Government was given 5 years from the date of statehood within which to vest title, through Presidential Executive order or act of Congress, to those ceded lands and territorial lands it controlled at the time of statehood, under permit, license, or permission of the Territory of Hawaii. Section 5 also provided for the return of lands to the State of Hawaii, once those lands, ceded for a public purpose, were no longer needed by the U.S. Government.

Throughout Hawaii's territorial period, Governors and Presidents exercised the power to set aside public lands for use by the U.S. Government. Numerous decrees were issued, reserving land for the U.S. military, parks and conservation, navigational and other purposes. Pursuant to the Admission Act, an initial inventory of Federal ceded lands was conducted in 1960. Since then, other attempts have been made to prepare an inventory of public lands held by the U.S. Government, both military and civilian. However, none to date have been successful. Numerous inconsistencies exist, which must be reconciled. A comprehensive, consolidated, and verified inventory is essential to determine the status of all public lands in Hawaii.

Accordingly, the Department of Defense shall submit to the General Services Administration [GSA] an inventory of all the real property in the State of Hawaii that is owned or controlled by the U.S. Department of Defense. The GSA shall be responsible for compiling a comprehensive inventory of military and civilian Federal property in Hawaii, and shall submit such inventory to the Congress no later than September 31, 1992. An interim report shall be submitted no later than June 1, 1992. To carry out this inventory, the Committee provides \$750,000.

The inventory shall identify and include: (1) ceded lands—title vested in the then Territory of Hawaii, and nonceded territorial lands, title vested in the then Territory of Hawaii; (2) ceded lands, title vested in the United States, but controlled and used by the then Territory of Hawaii; (3) ceded lands formally set aside by Presidential Executive orders for use by the U.S. Government; (4) then territorial lands formally set aside by gubernatorial executive orders for use by the U.S. Government; (5) ceded lands under the control of the then Territory of Hawaii, but used by the U.S. Government under permits and licenses; (6) nonceded lands and private lands acquired and used by the U.S. Government.

For each property identified, the inventory shall provide: (1) an explanation of how the land was acquired, including the date of acquisition, the history and the current status of the title, an identification of all current encumbrances and leases, the expiration date of all leases, contracts and other agreements, and a record of the cede lease fee or any other sums paid for the use of or title to the land; (2) the identity of past and present Federal users of the land, and a description of past and current use specifying which U.S. Government agency or department of the military has control of the property; (3) the obligations of the controlling U.S. Government agency or department of the military for the management and maintenance of the land.

Joint Recruiting Advertising Program.—The House deleted all funding for the Joint Recruiting Advertising Program [JRAP]. The Committee believes that there is no longer a need for joint television advertising and that service-specific television advertising is more effective. The Committee has, therefore, reduced JRAP's budget by \$3,000,000, the amount identified for television advertising. The Committee believes, however, that JRAP is invaluable in providing common services and materials for the services, including, but not limited to, buying lead lists for direct mail programs, conducting direct mail campaigns, conducting research on the youth market, and coordinating magazine advertising. The Committee provides an appropriation for JRAP of \$7,456,000.

Transition assistance funding.—The House prorated funding for transition assistance to the several services rather than retaining the funding in the Office of the Secretary of Defense as requested in the budget submission. Experience gained when the Military Child Care Act was implemented indicates that it is difficult to fund new programs to the extent required by Congress when funding is not provided from and accounted for at DOD level rather than local level. Retaining funding in the Office of the Secretary of Defense will assure that funds reach installations for the designated purposes and will allow for definitive tracking of execution. The Committee, therefore, has left funding for transition assistance in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Military Family Resource Center.—The House has reduced funding for the Military Family Resource Center by \$5,000,000 and required that the Military Family Resource Center [MFRC] be treated as a separate defense agency on DD Form 1414. The Committee does not agree with the House reduction and has provided the budget request. Even though MFRC funding increases dramatically in fiscal year 1992, funding provided accounts for only 53 percent of

program requirements in the important areas of child and spouse abuse. The Department of Defense has been successful in expanding its ability to identify and treat abuse, and the Committee applauds its continuing efforts. The Committee also believes that organizational status and location of the MFRC should remain as they are and that MFRC should not be treated as a separate defense agency.

Insurance plans for reservists.—One of the lessons learned from Operations Desert Shield/Desert Storm is that guardsmen and reservists recalled for these operations suffered financial hardships. It is also apparent that all reservists are reviewing their future commitment in light of the experience of those who were called to active duty. One of the major impacts on military members called to active duty was financial. Many of them were small businessmen and women or professionals who are now being faced with reestablishing their civilian livelihoods. A significant proportion are facing the task of rebuilding businesses that were either closed or adversely affected by their departure. Many others are faced with reconstructing personal finances that were damaged by the reduction in income resulting from recall to active duty.

Such changes in income cannot be compensated for through increased military income for reservists when they are called to active duty. However, the Government can help moderate the financial impact of such recalls in the future by establishing a low-cost, optional, self-insurance program for reservists. Such a program would allow each individual to purchase (through allotment from their Reserve pay) a level of insurance to maintain a desired proportion (up to 100 percent) of either their normal personal or business income that would permit them to meet their financial obligations in case of recall. Such options would be irrevocable while in the Selected Reserve to prevent adverse selection for coverage only during periods of increased tension.

The Committee directs the Department of Defense to investigate the feasibility of such an insurance program and to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House no later than June 1, 1992. This report should include an estimate of the number of reservists who would be eligible for such a program, an estimate of the cost at various levels of participation, and an estimate of the number of reservists who would participate.

LEGACY RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The Committee recommends an increase of \$15,000,000 to the request for the Legacy Resource Management Program.

The Committee commends the work of the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Environment), the military services, and nongovernmental organizations in the initial implementation of the Legacy Resource Management Program (Legacy Program). The Committee is pleased with the energy and enthusiasm with which DOD personnel and their colleagues in private conservation organizations have cooperated in the pursuit of Legacy objectives. Furthermore, the Committee is encouraged by the progress these individuals have made in establishing the program

as a premier example of the Department's creative potential and its commitment to effective resource management.

The Committee intends that the Legacy Program shall focus on the identification and management of sensitive and significant resources and that high priority shall be given to program areas which identify, document, and maintain biological diversity on military installations.

The Committee recognizes other natural and cultural resources management programs within the Office of the DASD(E) and the military services, but emphasizes that the Legacy Program—and associated funding—is to be focused specifically on sensitive and significant resources.

The Committee directs that funds provided under the Legacy Program shall be additive to those already provided under the services operation and maintenance budgets and not be a substitute for them.

The Committee is concerned that automated data processing [ADP] research and development, in relation to purpose four of the Legacy program established in Public Law 101-511, will become too costly for the efficient use of scarce Legacy funding. Wherever possible, existing methodologies for information management of sensitive and significant resources shall be utilized, minimizing investment in new ADP development.

Similarly, the Committee stresses the need for a coordinated approach among the services and the various disciplines involved in Legacy. Implementation of this program should not be hamstrung by the Government's Federal Information Procurement System [FIPS]. The Committee urges DOD to work with the General Services Administration [GSA] to streamline and consolidate the FIPS review into one process or programmatic authorization so that individual projects will not be delayed.

The Legacy Program encourages pro-active and innovative approaches to the management of resources that are in imminent danger of being lost or degraded. The Committee expects the Legacy Program to be an integral component of the Department's environmental management program. The Committee strongly believes that the purposes of the Legacy Program set forth in section 8120 of Public Law 101-511 are fully consistent with the Department's directive that "(c)onservation of natural resources and the military mission need not and shall not be mutually exclusive," and notes that it assists in fulfilling the Secretary's goal of having the "Department of Defense be the Federal leader in agency environmental compliance and protection."

The Committee intends that the DASD(E) and the services shall ensure adequate professional staffing and organizational alignment in the areas of natural and cultural resource management in order to accomplish the purposes of the Legacy Program. In an effort to ease full-time employee [FTE] requirements and the difficulties of hiring staff on a temporary or semipermanent basis, the Committee strongly encourages the use of Inter-governmental Personnel Act [IPA] personnel for nonpermanent assignments of a year or two.

The Committee also encourages the DASD(E) to consider funding a legacy pilot project which focuses on the interrelationship of cul-

tural, biological, geophysical, and historical resources in a single geographical zone. Such a project would demonstrate the unity of purpose behind Legacy Program and provide a model for integrated approaches to resource preservation.

Finally, the Committee wishes to clarify its view that the conservation and management of paleontological resources falls clearly within the purview of the Legacy Resources Management Program and its purposes.

The Committee directs that the DASD(E) report, no later than June 30, 1992, on the progress made in the implementation of the Legacy Program and its plans for fiscal year 1993 and the following 4 years. Similarly, the Committee directs that the scheduled submissions of planned projects for fiscal year 1992 set forth in the interim report on the Legacy Program (p. 6), be revised so that all deadlines will fall on or before July 15, 1992. This will allow the Committee to consider plans formulated for the Legacy Program in advance of the fiscal year 1993 Defense appropriations bill markup.

Stock enhancement on Federal lands.—The Committee believes that the Department of Defense, through the Legacy Resource Management Program and the Oceanic Institute, can play an important role in the conservation of endangered fish species by allowing its marine resources to be used for hatchery programs.

The Kaneohe Marine Corps Air Station was the site of a settled native Hawaiian community, heavily dependent upon the local fishery resources for their livelihood. This, and other local fisheries on the island of Oahu, served as an important nursery ground for Hawaiian mullet until they were depleted. The Oceanic Institute has made significant progress in the development of a marine stock enhancement technology which can be used to replenish some of Hawaii's depleted marine fish stocks, most notably the Hawaiian mullet.

Nursery ponds located at the Kaneohe Marine Corps Air Station can be used to support mullet culture and release activities to enhance the native mullet stocks in Kaneohe Bay. To initiate replenishment of those stocks, funding for 3 years is needed to conduct a feasibility study, to improve existing nursery ponds for mullet culture, to establish a hatchery for the culture of larvae to stock into these ponds, and to conduct a large-scale release of juvenile mullet into the bay.

The Committee believes the Legacy Program can make a significant contribution to the restoration of mullet stocks in Hawaii and strongly recommends that the Legacy Program give priority consideration to funding a 3-year pilot stock enhancement project through the Oceanic Institute.

Counterterrorist working group.—The Committee recommends funding the administration request of \$7,000,000 from the Department of Defense for the Counter Terrorist Working Group [CTWG]. The CTWG is an interagency body which coordinates counterterrorist research and development efforts between the Department of Defense and the Department of State.

An additional \$3,000,000 is requested by the administration through the "State Department diplomatic security salaries and expenses" account.

The Committee believes that the CTWG makes a valuable contribution to enhancing the security of persons and property Governmentwide and should receive full funding from both the Department of State [DOS] and the Department of Defense. The direct involvement of the DOS in the program allowed the CTWG to move quickly after the Pan Am 103 bombing to develop a chemical marker for preblast detection of plastic explosives.

The Committee believes strongly, however, that the CTWG should play a more active role in international efforts to combat terrorism. In the past, the CTWG's Department of Defense counterpart has shown a reluctance to engage in high-level technical collaboration with major non-NATO allies [MNNA] in an effort to explore new and more effective ways of combating terrorism.

Therefore, the Committee directs that \$5,000,000 of the sum provided to the CTWG be withheld from obligation and expenditure until permanent working groups are established between the CTWG and MNNA countries, collaborative agreements are signed, and a comprehensive report is provided to the Committees on specific areas of counterterrorist cooperation.

In addition, the Committee directs that the CTWG work with western and MNNA countries to determine the feasibility of establishing an international counterterrorist legal data base to more effectively assist in the apprehension and prosecution of terrorist suspects.

Furthermore, the Committee directs that DOD provide a report to the Committee, no later than April 15, 1992, on the progress of the CTWG in working with MNNA countries and in the establishment of a counterterrorist legal data base.

SPECIAL OPERATIONS

Coastal patrol boats.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$3,800,000 to the budget request for coastal patrol boats. This appropriation is required to meet shortfalls in unfunded requirements not budgeted at the time the eight boats were procured.

Readiness training.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$12,700,000 to the budget request for readiness training. This appropriation is needed to fund increased overseas deployments, jumping, advanced shooting, rubber raiding craft drops, diving, and intelligence.

Relocation of the 39th Special Operations Wing.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$2,600,000 to the budget request for the relocation of the 39th Special Operations wing from Rhine-Mein AFB. This funding results from the decision of the USAFE to accelerate base closures and realignments.

Miscellaneous equipment.—The Committee recommends an increase to the budget request by \$18,500,000 to fund equipment shortfalls in the following areas: diving, air support, safety, desert, cold weather, chemical defense, and parachutes.

Language training.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$4,700,000 to the budget request to fund the development and fielding of the second and third phases of a new Special Forces language course.

Technology base development resourcing.—In order to move Special Operations Forces to the leading edge of technology, the Committee desires U.S. Special Operations Command [USSOCOM] have the opportunity to compete for Department of Defense non-major force program 11 and other agency technology base development resources. In a resource constrained environment, major force program 11 will not be able to support high-risk, high-dollar, but high-value-added technology developments—particularly when these developments may possess the potential of supporting other Department of Defense components or Government agencies after being proven in the Special Operations mission environment. USSOCOM must be able to provide their validated, SOF-peculiar requirements to DOD and other Government technology base development communities for consideration in competitive resourcing, and to enter into cost-sharing relationships with the same. To restrict Special Operations Forces from non-MFP-11 resources will not allow Special Operations Forces to maintain the technological edge so important to their mission accomplishment.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

Appropriations, 1991	\$909,100,000
Budget estimate, 1992	937,200,000
House allowance	995,600,000
Committee recommendation	962,200,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$962,200,000 for fiscal year 1992. This is \$25,000,000 over the budget request.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

<i>Program</i>	<i>Committee adjustments</i>
End strength restoration	+ 31,000
DBOF military construction capital budget	— 2,200
DBOF technical corrections	— 1,700
Revised inflation estimate	— 2,100
Total adjustments	+ 25,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

Appropriations, 1991	\$998,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	816,100,000
House allowance	825,500,000
Committee recommendation	840,600,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$840,600,000 for fiscal year 1992. This is \$24,500,000 over the budget request.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

<i>Program</i>	<i>Committee adjustments</i>
End strength restoration.....	+ 28,000
Craft of opportunity.....	+ 2,000
DBOF military construction capital budget.....	- 3,500
DBOF technical corrections.....	- 200
Revised inflation estimate.....	- 1,800
Total adjustments.....	+ 24,500

CRAFT OF OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

The Committee recommends an addition of \$2,000,000 to provide for the operation and maintenance costs of continuation of the Craft of Opportunity Program [COOP], a mine countermeasures training program. One of the lessons learned from Operation Desert Shield was the need for better harbor and shallow waters mine countermeasures capabilities. It would be imprudent to discontinue the program at this time, and the Navy is directed to provide funding for both the Atlantic and Pacific fleets.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

Appropriations, 1991.....	\$84,800,000
Budget estimate, 1992.....	75,900,000
House allowance.....	85,900,000
Committee recommendation.....	81,700,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$81,700,000 for fiscal year 1992. This is an increase of \$5,800,000 over the budget request.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

<i>Program</i>	<i>Committee adjustments</i>
End strength restoration.....	+ 6,000
Revised inflation estimate.....	- 200
Total adjustments.....	+ 5,800

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

Appropriations, 1991.....	\$1,065,900,000
Budget estimate, 1992.....	1,075,400,000
House allowance.....	1,091,200,000
Committee recommendation.....	1,077,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriations of \$1,077,000,000 for fiscal year 1992. This is an increase of \$1,600,000 over the budget request.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

<i>Program</i>	<i>Committee adjustments</i>
End strength restoration.....	+ 1,000
WC-130 weather reconnaissance mission.....	+ 5,300
DBOF military construction capital budget.....	- 1,500
DBOF technical corrections.....	- 800
Revised inflation estimate.....	- 2,400
Total adjustments.....	+ 1,600

WC-130 Weather Reconnaissance Squadron.—The Committee recommends that \$5,300,000 be added to the Air Force Reserve appropriation for the WC-130 mission.

The Committee continues to insist that the Department of Defense provide full budgetary and operational support for the WC-130 Weather Reconnaissance Squadron. The direction from the Committee is clear. DOD is to dedicate sufficient manpower and airframes to the WC-130 mission to support 1,600 hurricane reconnaissance flight hours and sufficient additional hours for aircrew proficiency training, to generate up to five sorties a day, and to cover the Atlantic, Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and Hawaii in accordance with the national hurricane operations plan.

The Committee expects that the Air Force Reserve squadron will support the full complement of aircraft needed for the hurricane mission and that funds will be added to the budget request to make up for the shortfall.

Finally, the Committee directs that nothing be done to disestablish or diminish the operational activity or mission effectiveness of the WC-130 Weather Reconnaissance Squadron. In agreeing to the transfer of this mission to the Air Force Reserve, the Department of Defense also pledged to maintain the full capability of this vital national asset. The Committee is committed to seeing to it that the Department's pledge is carried out.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

Appropriations, 1991.....	\$1,980,400,000
Budget estimate, 1992.....	2,080,700,000
House allowance.....	2,165,600,000
Committee recommendation.....	2,125,800,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,125,800,000 for fiscal year 1992. This is an increase of \$45,100,000 over the budget request.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimates are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

<i>Program</i>	<i>Committee adjustments</i>
End strength restoration.....	+ 65,000
DBOF military construction capital budget.....	- 5,000
DBOF technical corrections.....	- 10,300
Revised inflation estimate.....	- 4,600
Total adjustments.....	+ 45,100

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Appropriations, 1991	\$2,247,200,000
Budget estimate, 1992	2,287,800,000
House allowance	2,275,700,000
Committee recommendation	2,276,300,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,276,300,000 for fiscal year 1992. This is a decrease of \$11,500,000 from the budget request.

Idaho National Guard Apache conversion.—The Committee recognizes that the programmed conversion from the UH-1M to the AH-64 Apache at the Idaho National Guard has met numerous delays. Further, the Committee is concerned that foreign military sales of the Apache helicopter have taken a priority over the domestic fielding program. While it is apparent that Operations Desert Shield/Storm and related activities have placed a burden on the Apache fielding programs, the Committee believes it is imperative this conversion take place in a timely fashion.

Therefore, the Committee again directs that the Secretary of the Army provide adequate funding to provide full fielding requirements of equipment, training, and full-time technician, AGR, and active duty support personnel so that the Idaho National Guard conversion be completed as expeditiously as possible.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget request are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Committee adjustments
DBOF military construction capital account	— 4,000
DBOF technical corrections	— 2,400
Revised inflation estimate	— 5,100
Total adjustments	— 11,500

NATIONAL BOARD FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE

Appropriations, 1991	\$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	5,000,000
House allowance	5,000,000
Committee recommendation	5,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,000,000, the same amount as requested and provided by the House.

The 1991 National Defense Authorization Act included a provision that terminates Department of Defense support for the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice at the end of fiscal year 1992. The Committee is concerned that termination of funding for this program could degrade military preparedness and recruitment efforts for the Armed Forces. The Committee has included bill language requesting the President to evaluate the contributions to military readiness by the National Board's activities and report on the impact of a possible termination of funding to Congress.

As the defense budget decreases steadily over the next few years, the benefits provided by the activities of the National Board may

grow in significance to the Department of Defense. The Committee believes the decision to terminate Federal support for these programs may be premature, and hopes that this review by the President will clarify the existing and potential future missions for the National Board.

COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

Appropriations, 1991	\$5,400,000
Budget estimate, 1992	5,500,000
House allowance	5,500,000
Committee recommendation	5,500,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,500,000, the same as requested and provided in the House allowance.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WORLD UNIVERSITY GAMES

Appropriations, 1991	
Budget estimate, 1992	
House allowance	\$3,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,000,000. This is \$1,000,000 above the budget estimate and \$2,000,000 below the House allowance.

COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends funding of \$1,000,000 to cover initial costs of providing logistical and other support for the 1993 World University Games to be held in the State of New York. This support and funding amount was approved in the 1992 Senate Defense authorization bill.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, 1996 SUMMER OLYMPICS

Appropriations, 1991	
Budget estimate, 1992	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	\$2,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,000,000. This is \$2,000,000 above the budget estimate and the House allowance.

COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends funding of \$2,000,000 to cover initial costs of providing logistical and other support for the 1996 Summer Olympics to be held in Atlanta, GA. This support and funding amount was approved in the 1992 Senate Defense authorization bill.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1991	
Budget estimate, 1992	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	\$1,000,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,000,000,000. This is \$1,000,000,000 above the budget estimate and the House allowance.

COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Real property maintenance [RPM] is the repair and minor construction of buildings on bases, port facilities, housing, and other infrastructure. In its 1992 request, the Department proposes to fund only about three-fourths of its purported new maintenance requirements, causing the backlog of deferred maintenance to rise dramatically. To address this problem, the House appropriations bill provides to the services' O&M accounts a total of \$1,000,000,000 above the level requested in the budget for RPM. (The House, as it has for other readiness-related program increases, prohibits the use of these funds until the last month of fiscal year 1992.) The Senate-approved authorization bill also provides additional funds (\$300,000,000).

The Department of Defense's infrastructure of bases, logistical support facilities, ports, and housing represents a vast investment of public funds now valued at over \$608,000,000,000. This infrastructure is one of the foundations of our national power and is instrumental to the morale and effectiveness of our Armed Forces.

Many of DOD's facilities were built during World War II and the early cold war period. These facilities have now aged considerably, and require substantial investments to keep them usable. But, because of recent fiscal constraints, the Department reports each year a growth in repair projects that have been deferred due to lack of funding. Even though growth in deferred maintenance is expected to subside as bases are closed and forces are withdrawn from overseas, there will remain a substantial number of unfunded repair projects at many U.S. installations.

DOD's proposed funding level for RPM declines significantly from the level provided in 1991. Yet, as described above, requirements for repair and maintenance are, in fact, increasing. The combination of these two trends results in a dramatic leap of 36 percent in the backlog of unfunded projects. Although the Committee is deeply concerned that worthwhile repair and maintenance projects have not been funded in the President's request, its recommendations are tempered by the following considerations:

One, the discretionary nature of RPM funding has led to continual budget underexecution. More often than not, base commanders consider funds for repairing and maintaining buildings less compulsory in nature than funds for such critical activities as unit training and base operations. So, it is common practice to move funding planned for RPM activities to these more critical programs whenever unforeseen requirements arise. This practice presents a dilemma to Congress: There is no guarantee that funds provided to reduce repair backlogs will be used to do so. To solve this dilemma, the House in its 1992 bill has limited the Department's discretion in reprogramming RPM funds.

Two, the lack of accurate and meaningful budget information provided to Congress on real property maintenance activities precludes a reasonable assessment of the Department's needs. To justi-

fy and explain its RPM activities, the Department provides summary performance and budget data normally submitted for all other O&M programs. The Department also estimates the total accrued value of projects not funded in the budget. This is known as the BMAR, or backlog of maintenance and repair. It is this measure which in the past has received the most attention. Unfortunately, the BMAR represents little more than a calculation made only at the most summary levels. Little information is known or available detailing which bases require the most work and where. For example, the Department was able to provide only rough estimates of the share of BMAR occurring overseas. DOD also has been unable to show what effects the recent base closure recommendations will have on its RPM requirements and maintenance backlog. This lack of useful information robs Congress of effective oversight of these programs and limits its ability to promote rational investment decisions. Congress is left to proceed virtually on faith alone.

Three, the current restructuring of our Armed Forces and closing and realigning of bases combine to make facility investment decisions that much more difficult. There is no doubt that the number of repair and maintenance projects will decrease, but where and when is not yet fully known.

Assessing the Department's real property maintenance requirements is problematic at best. Thus, providing additional funds to reduce DOD's unfunded maintenance backlog is a bit like taking a shot in the dark—you know something's out there, but not what it is, how big, how bad, or even where it is. Moreover, when Congress has acted in the past to provide more funding for RPM activities, in many instances that funding has been used for other projects.

The Committee notes that a wide range of conditions exists today in the DOD infrastructure. Selected installations have excellent facilities, having benefited from military construction projects and sufficient RPM funding in recent years. At these installations, reduced levels of RPM funding will have little effect. But, the Department has indicated that funds for repair projects at logistical, transportation, R&D, and other low-profile installations have been continually less than adequate. To specifically address funding deficiencies at these types of installations, the Committee provides an additional \$950,000,000 above the administration's request for RPM funding in 1992. These funds are to be made available to cover deferred projects in both O&M and RDT&E appropriations.

Further, the Committee directs the Department to initiate a pilot program of facility condition surveys. The goal of this program is to improve information available on RPM activities and enhance congressional oversight. These surveys will include what are known as fence-to-fence engineering assessments (a technique developed by the Army Corps of Engineers) of all facilities located at a base or shipyard. They will serve as a basis for a maintenance plan for each base, listing projects by priority and including cost estimates. In the beginning, only DOD's most important installations will be surveyed. (A listing of bases proposed for survey is shown below.) Funding of \$50,000,000 is added to cover the costs of the surveys proposed for 1992.

This pilot program will provide a foundation on which Congress can draw better, more informed conclusions on the Department's

actual maintenance needs. First, it will provide accurate, documented information on the RPM requirements at our most important bases. Second, Congress will be able to use the information to more accurately assess the level of unfunded maintenance that exists today; in other words, the myth and uncertainty surrounding DOD's backlog calculations can be reduced. And last, it could provide a method for Congress to account for the spending of RPM appropriations in the future.

The Committee, like the House, is concerned that these funds be spent in the manner intended. So, to facilitate the management and oversight of this funding and pilot program, the Committee establishes the "Real property maintenance" account under the supervision of the Comptroller of the Department of Defense. Bill language has been added which delineates restrictions on the use of these funds.

BASES TO BE SURVEYED IN 1992

Army: Fort Bragg, Fort Lewis, Fort Polk, Fort Stewart, Fort Hood, Fort Campbell, and Redstone Arsenal.

Navy: Norfolk, San Diego, Charleston, and Pearl Harbor.

Air Force: Kelly AFB, Hill AFB, Elmendorf AFB, Wright-Patterson AFB, and Dover AFB.

Marines: Pendelton and Quantico.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE

Appropriations, 1991	\$1,062,527,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,252,900,000
House allowance	2,152,900,000
Committee recommendation	1,183,900,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,183,900,000. This is \$69,000,000 below the budget estimate and \$969,000,000 below the House allowance.

COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

OVERVIEW

The Committee recommends that the Defense Environmental Restoration Program [DERP] be funded at the requested level of \$1,252,900,000 with \$69,000,000 of this amount to be transferred to the 1990 "Base closure" account.

The request level for DERP represents an increase of \$190,383,000 above the fiscal year 1991 enacted level. The House bill allowed \$1,252,900,000 or \$900,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee believes that the House recommended increase, specifically made unavailable for obligation or expenditure until September 1, 1992, cannot be executed in the time allotted.

The Committee remains concerned at the pace at which hazardous wastesites located on Department of Defense lands are being cleaned up. The Committee is sensitive to public criticism that the site remediation is proceeding too slowly and that an excessive amount of funding provided for the program is being applied to studies, rather than actual restoration activities.

The Committee recognizes the efforts made by the Department to hasten the cleanup process and the timetable which has been put into place to handle sites on the national priority list [NPL]. Nevertheless, the process of cleanup is too slow should be accelerated.

From fiscal year 1984 through fiscal year 1989, the DERP received \$2,100,000,000 for the 8,200 sites identified within DOD. For fiscal year 1989 the DERP received \$500,000,000. Today, there are an estimated 1,855 contaminated U.S. military bases with hazardous dumps, containing 17,482 dumps with some level of contamination. Estimates on the cost of cleaning up these sites could exceed \$20,000,000,000 over the next decade.

The Committee believes that more can be done to expedite the process of cleanup and recommends several initiatives which it believes could make a significant contribution to that goal.

Contracts for certain expedited environmental restoration activities.—The Committee is concerned with the slow pace of actual cleanup of environmental problems on military bases. The Model Base Closure Cleanup Program authorized in fiscal year 1991 attempted to expedite cleanup of closed bases, but progress under this program has been slow. Ten years of experience in EPA's Superfund Program demonstrates how remediation can be delayed and costs escalated as multiple contractors study and restudy a problem, Federal managers and regulators delay decisions, and final remediation costs greatly exceed original expectations.

DOD estimates the total cost of the Installation Restoration Program to be over \$14,000,000,000.

The Committee believes that DOD should take steps now to accelerate actual environmental cleanup, to reduce cleanup costs, and to get delivery of actual cleanup services from competent contractors. For this purpose, the Committee directs the Department of Defense to commence a pilot Expedited Environmental Cleanup Program for at least five major cleanup projects to be selected by each military department.

This program is based on the following principles: (1) Full compliance with all environmental laws; (2) use of existing authorities when appropriate for substantial cleanups; (3) use of turnkey contracts to cover more than one phase of any cleanup; (4) establishment of special expedited procedures for any required approval of DOD actions by other Federal, State, and local agencies; and (5) use of competition in contract solicitation and contractor competency and cost in contract awards. The Committee directs the secretaries of the military departments to select projects identified in the Installation Restoration Program within 30 days for expedited cleanup. The Committee also mandates immediate establishment of expedited procedures for obtaining required approvals, agreements, and actions within the Federal Government.

The Committee recommends that the secretaries of the military departments use this pilot program to develop new methods of expediting environmental cleanup at military bases. For example, the turnkey contract approach could be used to perform all tasks needed to remediate the site from further investigation, to remedial design, to final remediation and restoration.

Greater use of existing authority for substantial cleanup such as the CERCLA interim remedial action could allow major progress

on site cleanup to go forward while a final ultimate solution is developed. Greater use of fixed price contracting either for the entire project or for a fixed unit price for the volume of waste materials processed could lead to improved contractor incentives to produce the level of cleanup agreed upon rather than performing unnecessary tasks.

The Committee expects each military department to report on the initiatives taken, the results obtained, and suggestions for further improvement on expedited cleanup in the report referred to in 10 U.S.C. 2706.

Thermal destruction pyrolysis process.—The Committee has earmarked \$2,000,000 to be made available to the Secretary of Defense to finance a feasibility study on the use of a rotary reactor thermal destruction pyrolysis process for the treatment and disposal of hazardous wastes. The Committee is concerned that highly complex waste composed of RCRA regulated material and radioactive waste is being produced at DOD installations in the United States. The complex nature of the treatment of this waste has prevented its effective treatment and disposal. This result in mounting storage costs until a suitable disposal technology is identified.

The thermal destruction pyrolysis process will convert the mixed waste to radioactive waste only, thereby allowing existing technology to be utilized for the disposal of the remaining radioactive portion. The process does not release radioactivity into the environment. Once the feasibility of this process is demonstrated, the Committee would anticipate that the Department would budget funding to design, procure and operate full scale facilities at selected waste sites to effect the treatment of these wastes and eliminate the continuing costly storage.

Umatilla Army Depot.—The Umatilla Army Depot, OR, is scheduled for realignment under the Base Closure Act. This conventional and chemical weapons depot has significant environmental pollution and is one site currently listed on the national priorities list. The Committee strongly urges the Department of Defense to fund a consortium of State and local officials to participate in the development of an orderly, comprehensive long-term plan for the protection and productive development of area resources as the Army proceeds with the phase-down, cleanup, and mitigation of the Umatilla Army Depot.

Evaluation of residual World War II environmental hazards.—The 1991 Defense Appropriations Act provided \$900,000 to assess environmental damage and remediation requirements at four World War II era Army sites in Alaska: Great Sitkin, Kiska, Attu and Amchitka. The Army Corps of Engineers recently informed the Committee of the status of this effort, and indicated that the final report and findings will not be available until 1992. The Committee has been informed separately on the status of the survey and assessment of cleanup requirements at the Elson Lagoon site near Barrow, AK. The Committee expects the survey and planning work to be conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers to address the full clearing of the site, rather than a limited navigation channel at Elson Lagoon. The Committee appreciates the efforts of the Army Corps of Engineers on this project, and will look forward to receiving the final report on these sites not later than August 1, 1992.

Red water contamination.—The Committee notes that the Army's Toxic and Hazardous Materials Agency [USATHAMA] has identified, studied, and assessed the various technologies that are relevant to the remediation of red water contamination from the production of TNT and related substances. The Committee commends the Army for undertaking this study, but is concerned by its slow pace in conducting pilot scale testing of the most promising of the 30 red water remediation technologies that it has reviewed.

The Committee recommends the Army to initiate during fiscal year 1992 a pilot scale test program on those top-ranked technologies identified in the secondary evaluation of the USATHAMA study with the goal of optimum treatment and destruction of red water and subsequent sidestream effluents in order to comply with applicable State and Federal environmental regulations.

Environmental bioremediation restoration technology.—The Committee continues to support the environmental bioremediation restoration technology initiative highlighted in the conference report to the fiscal year 1991 Department of Defense Appropriations bill (H.R. 5803), and is disturbed at the Department's failure to release funding for this extremely important undertaking. While the committee is committed to supporting the Department's Environmental Restoration Program, it strongly believes that the department should provide greater support for the development and transfer of environmental bioremediation restoration technologies. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide \$3,500,00 to a nonprofit institution with expertise in applied environmental bioremediation technology for the purpose of establishing an advanced process integration, scale-up and applied technology demonstration program in environmental bioremediation restoration technology.

Nontoxic maintenance substitutes.—The Committee recognizes the problem of hazardous waste disposal and the need to address this growing public concern along a broad array of research and engineering fronts. There are few areas where the problem of waste generation is more acute than in the manufacturing and maintenance of heavy equipment and weapons platforms. The Committee believes that the development of new nontoxic industrial substances and nonpolluting manufacturing techniques is an imperative in today's society.

While the Department of Defense is one of our Nation's principal generators of hazardous wastes, it is also a leader in the areas of waste reduction and remediation. In the "Operation and maintenance, Air Force" section of this report, the Committee recognized the work of the Air Force in developing carbon dioxide pellet blasting as a nontoxic method for paint removal and aircraft cleaning.

The Committee recommends that the Department of Defense investigate the range of emerging technologies allowing the substitute of nontoxic engineering and maintenance materials for hazardous materials now in use by the services. The Secretary of Defense is to report back to the Committee, no later than June 1, 1992, on its findings and the funding proposed for research into this area over the next 3 years.

HUMANITARIAN RELIEF

Appropriations, 1991	\$15,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	13,000,000
House allowance	15,000,000
Committee recommendation	13,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$13,000,000. This is the same as requested and \$2,000,000 below the House allowance.

COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

OVERVIEW

The Committee wishes to commend the outstanding work of the Department of Defense's Office of Global Affairs and its Humanitarian Assistance Program [HAP]. The past year has seen a dramatic increase in the number of natural and manmade disasters which required a quick and efficient response by the Department. This, the Office of Global Affairs, has responded swiftly to these needs, saving of countless human lives and relieving untold suffering. With a small staff of less than 10 highly talented professionals, the Office makes an extraordinary, and often unique, contribution to the advancement of U.S. foreign policy interests worldwide.

The Humanitarian Assistance Program is responsible for the transportation of nonlethal Department of Defense material to areas of acute human need. Items excess to the Department's needs, such as blankets, tents, food, medicine, and light tools make up the bulk of the relief supplies HAP transports.

In recent years, the Office of Global Affairs has responded to humanitarian appeals in over 60 countries. The Office has assisted in Kurdish refugee relief and resettlement; provided emergency food to Ethiopia in one of the largest military airlift relief operations in the history of Africa; facilitated food relief and food distribution in Bangladesh; provided the first ever emergency food relief by the United States Government to Albania; provided disaster relief to the Philippines; and contributed humanitarian relief supplies to Poland, Romania, and other emerging democracies in Eastern Europe.

The DOD Office of Humanitarian Assistance also has sustained the longstanding Afghan and Cambodian relief programs and transported supplies to areas of distress in Latin America and the Caribbean.

The Committee recommends a change in the notification requirement for the transportation of humanitarian relief, permitting HAP to provide Congress with a 15-day, as opposed to the current 21-day, prior notification. The Committee recognizes that the 21-day notification requirement is often cumbersome and in recent years led to serious delays in responding to the Chinese flood disaster, food shortages in Angola, and a relief appeal by the new democratic Nicaraguan Government. Lives were undoubtedly lost due to the 21-day notification rule.

The Committee strongly opposes efforts to limit or terminate the authorities governing the Office of Humanitarian Assistance. The Committee believes such efforts are shortsighted and contrary to

U.S. national interest. The good will engendered toward the United States through its humanitarian relief efforts cannot be overstated. At a time when American foreign policy is the subject of controversy in many parts of the world, the generosity of spirit as seen in our relief programs provides tangible, lasting proof of our humanitarian values.

The Committee views as erroneous the suggestion that excessive quantities of DOD excess property is being denied the States in favor of the Humanitarian Assistance Program. The facts speak for themselves. Between 1986 and 1990, the total dollar value of the excess property absorbed by HAP has averaged a mere 4.8 percent of the total—a truly insignificant amount. The same is true for heavy equipment declared excess by the DOD. Here, the States claimed 98.7 percent of the total in 1990 compared to only 1.3 percent going into the Humanitarian Assistance Program.

The Committee believes strongly that the DOD Office of Global Affairs and all aspects of its Humanitarian Assistance Program merit continued congressional support.

COMPARISON OF STATES AND HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

WITHDRAWALS OF EXCESS HEAVY EQUIPMENT FROM DLA DRMOS IN THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES, FISCAL YEAR 1990

	Acquisition value	Percent of total
States.....	\$50,190,393	98.7
Humanitarian Assistance Program.....	662,781	1.3
Total.....	50,853,174	100.0

COMPARISON OF STATES AND HAP SHARE OF EXCESS PROPERTY BY YEAR

Fiscal year	Line item	Percent by item	Dollar value	Dollar value (percent)
1986:				
States.....	\$165,231	95.9	\$238,650,861	98.0
HAP.....	7,153	4.1	4,913,154	2.0
Total, 1986.....		100.0		100.0
1987:				
States.....	181,243	93.0	252,995,999	96.3
HAP.....	13,727	7.0	9,680,037	3.7
Total, 1987.....		100.0		100.0
1988:				
States.....	208,083	91.2	286,111,470	94.7
HAP.....	20,003	8.8	16,077,577	5.3
Total, 1988.....		100.0		100.0
1989:				
States.....	122,580	88.4	261,192,792	93.7
HAP.....	16,053	11.6	17,658,000	6.3
Total, 1989.....		100.0		100.0
1990:				
States.....	166,835	86.8	292,289,946	92.9

COMPARISON OF STATES AND HAP SHARE OF EXCESS PROPERTY BY YEAR—Continued

Fiscal year	Line item	Percent by item	Dollar value	Dollar value (percent)
HAP	17,775	13.2	22,192,967	7.1
Total, 1990		100.0		100.0

Operation Smile.—The Committee commends Operation Smile International, a volunteer medical corps, which provides surgical training and health care services in developing countries. Largely devoted to conducting reconstructive surgeries, training local medical professions in specialized techniques, and providing followup health care services, Operation Smile continues to broaden its base of private and volunteer support from doctors and donors of supplies and equipment. Once again, the Committee encourages the expansion of the work of Operation Smile in aiding indigent children and families in the developing world.

The Committee also believes that Operation Smile has an important role to play in communicating what is best in American values and ideals and should be strongly supported. The Committee urges the Office of Humanitarian Assistance of the Department of Defense to coordinate with the Department of State to provide Operation Smile with excess property for its missions and to assist in making arrangements for its transportation as needed.

TITLE III PROCUREMENT

ESTIMATES AND APPROPRIATION SUMMARY

The fiscal year 1992 Department of Defense procurement budget request totals \$63,370,700,000. The accompanying bill recommends \$63,058,298,000 in new budget authority. The total amount recommended is a decrease of \$312,402,000 below the fiscal year 1992 amended budget estimate and is \$1,587,541,000 below the amounts provided by the House allowance. The table below summarizes the budget estimates and the Committee recommendations:

(In thousands of dollars)

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation versus—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Army:					
Aircraft.....	1,667,700	1,730,787	1,640,200	- 27,500	- 90,587
Missile.....	1,035,800	1,109,595	1,009,456	- 26,344	- 100,139
Weapons.....	839,100	1,084,813	1,003,096	+ 163,996	- 81,717
Ammunition.....	1,249,800	1,364,859	1,325,421	+ 75,621	- 39,438
Other.....	3,163,800	3,021,435	3,013,798	- 150,002	- 7,637
Navy:					
Aircraft.....	7,966,400	7,683,633	7,025,920	- 940,480	- 657,713
Weapons.....	4,581,300	4,726,795	4,611,848	+ 30,548	- 114,947
Ships.....	8,493,200	10,595,704	7,725,382	- 767,818	- 2,870,322
Other.....	6,471,200	6,574,568	6,306,544	- 164,656	- 268,024
Marine.....	1,039,400	1,043,218	1,100,570	+ 61,170	+ 57,352
Air Force:					
Aircraft.....	11,115,500	7,444,121	10,349,396	- 766,104	+ 2,905,275
(Total funding available).....	(11,115,500)	(7,444,121)	(11,071,596)	(- 43,904)	(+ 3,627,475)
Missiles.....	5,599,800	5,243,841	5,332,671	- 267,129	+ 88,830
(Total funding available).....	(5,599,800)	(5,243,841)	(5,428,171)	(- 171,629)	(+ 184,330)
Other.....	8,058,100	8,001,524	7,859,296	- 198,804	- 142,228
(Total funding available).....	(8,058,100)	(8,001,524)	(7,958,619)	(- 99,481)	(- 42,905)
Defense agencies.....	2,089,600	2,708,446	2,087,400	- 2,200	- 621,046
National Guard and Reserve equipment.....		1,292,500	667,300	+ 667,300	- 625,200
Defense Production Act purchases.....		25,000			- 25,000
Procurement of prepositioning equipment.....		995,000			- 995,000
Sealift and prepositioning.....			2,000,000	+ 2,000,000	+ 2,000,000
Total procurement.....	63,370,700	64,645,839	63,058,298	- 312,402	- 1,587,541
(Total funding available.....)	(63,370,700)	(64,645,839)	(63,975,321)	(+ 604,621)	(- 670,518)

PROCUREMENT OVERVIEW

The recommendations for the fiscal year 1992 program incorporate, with the information available, lessons learned from the Department's experience during Operations Desert Shield/Storm, impact of base closure proposals, changes in the threat profile to our national security interests, and execution experience not reflected in the Department's request. It should be noted that due to the recent, rapid and abrupt, political and economic changes around the globe, particularly in Eastern Europe and with the break up of the Soviet Union, the recommended adjustments are only a beginning of the significant changes that are likely to occur within the Department's acquisition strategy over the next several years.

The Committee feels strongly that since the submission of the President's budget to Congress, world events, new information concerning the progress of the Department's major acquisition programs, as well as other numerous factors, require that virtually every facet of the defense procurement program be scrutinized regardless of the priority of the program or the promises of its effectiveness to preserve national and global interests.

The Committee actions within this section of the report address such matters as the upgrade of the Army's M-1 tank inventory to a higher configuration—but at what cost and what rate to still stay within the Army's available resources, maintain a viable industrial base, and be capable to counter the current and future threat? Issues raised by the Committee within Navy programs include stop-gap procurement of CH-46E helicopters to bridge Marine Corps requirements until the V-22 Osprey is expected to reach production approval, and discontinuation of the proposed CH-53 alternative to the V-22. Air Force programs addressed by the Committee include restart of the F-117 production program and development of an associated reconnaissance capability for these aircraft, continuation of the current production rates for the MX (Peacekeeper) missile, and reexamination of the B-2 program in light of its recent testing problems.

The Committee has strongly supported the continued upgrade of our Guard and Reserve components to ensure the high level of readiness that is so vital to the effective operation of the total force concept as ably demonstrated in the Persian Gulf this past year. Moreover, the Committee has added \$2,000,000,000 for the procurement of sealift assets and additional prepositioning equipment toward fulfilling critical shortfalls in the Department's ability to respond rapidly by sea. The Committee also recommends adjustments to several programs that received additional funding in the fiscal year 1991 Desert Storm supplemental which have subsequently impacted the fiscal year 1992 funded production period to the extent that adjustments could be made without adversely impacting production rates within the affected programs. Finally, the Committee feels that the Department's actions to streamline and improve administrative processes are critical to the Department's ability to accomplish its mission within a continually shrinking pool of resources without unnecessarily sacrificing readiness by having to support inefficient overhead management information

systems. Thus, as in fiscal year 1991, the Committee supports the consolidation of funding for automated data processing development and modernization efforts related to the corporate information management initiative and computer-aided acquisition and logistics support program.

AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING [ADP]

The use of ADP equipment and services permeates the operations of the Department, whether the function is related to strategic, tactical, logistic, or administrative missions. While most functions performed within the Department, services, and defense agencies require the use of some form of ADP, little has been accomplished in the past to either monitor, integrate, or control the proliferation of ADP resources. While this practice has not previously impaired the Department in accomplishing its mission, it has become increasingly clear in recent years that ADP resources used throughout the Department must be able to intercommunicate, transfer and receive data from various sources, and operate in a near real-time environment in order to support the decisionmaking process.

In responding to this requirement, the Department has taken several positive steps through the decision to use the Ada programming language in software development, the incorporation of open system architectures which are designed to operate virtually any nonproprietary software with little or no alterations, as well as other efforts that will wean the Department from the use of proprietary hardware and software in its nontactical ADP systems.

The Department has also taken to the method of awarding ADP contracts on an indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity basis that allows for the rapid acquisition of hardware and software to meet increasing demands on ADP capabilities. These contracts have proven to be extremely popular since many of the existing hardware platforms fielded today are technologically outdated and can no longer keep pace with advancements in processing speed, memory capacity, visual/graphics capabilities, et cetera. Moreover, the structure of these contracts allow any customer with available funds to quickly meet its ADP resource needs without being burdened by the normally lengthy acquisition process within the Department.

The Department has reached a crossroad in ADP and has now embarked down a path of ADP consolidations, consideration of single systems to serve similar requirements for all services and defense agencies, and requiring the interoperability and timeliness of system architectures to support the Department's increasing reliance on ADP to serve the Department's needs while it draws down its resources in other areas. While this occurs, the Department needs to ensure that it proceeds prudently in a manner that does not inflict any further degradation to its force structure and readiness posture.

Outsourcing.—Information technology has increased at such a rapid pace over the last decade that the Department is facing the prospect of acquiring inferior ADP resources due to the length of its acquisition process. The Department reacts slowly to innova-

tions and improvements in information technology that could be beneficial if obtained in a more timely manner. The Committee believes that the current environment of reduced resources compels the Department to take those steps necessary to obtain information technology faster and more responsively in order to mitigate the impact of reductions in force structure and supporting resources. Therefore, the Department is encouraged to establish a pilot information technology leasing capability that will quickly and economically place current information technology into the hands of Department users. This capability will consist of a centrally managed leasing organization having the capability to assess departmental requirements for information technology and meet those requirements quickly through commercial leasing arrangements. The Department will establish appropriate approval procedures and a funding mechanism to recover the cost of the equipment from users of the leases. The Department is requested to provide to Congress, by May 31, 1992, a report of its information technology leasing activities, plans, and accomplishments.

Indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity [IDIQ] contracts.—IDIQ contracts have enabled the Department to quickly acquire ADP resources without having to endure lengthy administrative and manufacturing leadtimes prior to receipt of the equipment and associated peripherals and software. In recent years, the Department's portrayal of resources budgeted for purchases on IDIQ contracts has been significantly lower than the level of purchases experienced. This practice indicates the Department's insatiable appetite for ADP resources and also highlights its inability to control spending habits by the services and their various program offices. Research by the Committee indicates that the Department is in the process of purchasing nearly 1,300,000 lap-top computers, workstations, personal computers, as well as associated peripherals and software at a cost of nearly \$10,000,000,000. These figures are made even more staggering by the fact that they do not include ADP resource acquisitions for strategic, tactical, or intelligence information systems, and those systems, networks, and hardware contracts that are estimated at a value that does not require higher level review and approval.

The Committee is concerned about the Department of Defense's lack of oversight of requirements and IDIQ-type contracts for the purchase of computer hardware, software, and support. Some of these contracts have a maximum potential value of over \$1,000,000,000. While these contracts are put into place to streamline the acquisition and lower the costs of fielding computers to Defense activities, there is no standard policy requiring the review of orders submitted under these contracts to control unnecessary, duplicative, and other wasteful orders.

The Committee believes that considerable improvements need to be made in the way the Department controls these contracts. The Committee directs an OSD-level review of the oversight of these contracts in its life cycle management policies. This oversight must include steps to preclude excessive ordering and that all orders are consistent with any corporate information management initiatives. Furthermore, the Committee directs the Department to establish controls on these contracts which limit the level of fiscal year 1992

purchases to those amounts requested in the President's budget exhibit 43 (or as adjusted by Congress) and authority to exceed these levels must be granted from the appropriate action officer within the Office of Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence). The Committee directs the Department to report to Congress, by March 1, 1992, on the steps taken to strengthen oversight of these contracts. In addition, the Committee requests a summary listing of waivers granted by dollar amount and appropriation through the third quarter of fiscal year 1992 to be provided not later than July 15, 1992, and a final report on fiscal year 1992 due not later than October 31, 1992.

The contracts falling under this requirement are: Desktop III/IV, Supermini, lightweight computer unit, common hardware/software, small multiuser computer, lapheld II, standard multiuser small computer requirements contract, standard desktop computer companion contract, and sustaining base information system.

Desktop III contract.—Desktop III is an indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity contract administered by the Air Force. This contract contains a significant number of systems that are backlogged due to demand in excess of number of systems being produced. The Air Force recently restructured the delivery allocations on the contract. As a result, the Army and Navy monthly delivery allocations have been reduced by nearly 25 percent. Given the large backlogs that already exist, this reallocation will further increase the amount of time that the Army and Navy must wait for the delivery of ordered equipment. In order to adjust for this reallocation, the budgeted Desktop III purchases for the Army and Navy are reduced by 25 percent. The recommended adjustments are as follows:

Army:	
Operation and maintenance (includes Army stock fund).....	—\$9,870,000
Other procurement	—2,040,000
Total.....	—11,910,000
Navy: Operation and maintenance (includes revolving funds).....	—5,485,000

Automated data processing operations consolidations.—As a result of the defense management review, the Department has embarked on an initiative to consolidate ADP design and operations functions. This effort is intended to improve the quality and efficiency of general purpose computer support. The Department has directed that these consolidations be based on a sound business approach, supported by current workload/site analysis, and have completed economic analyses to substantiate the consolidation initiative. As of August 1991, neither the Army, the Navy, nor the Air Force have completed either the required economic analyses or business cases.

The Committee strongly supports the Department's initiative to consolidate ADP design and operations and believes that significant savings can be realized. However, the Committee does not think it prudent to effect the intended consolidations until the appropriate reviews and analyses have been completed. Furthermore, the Committee believes that strong central management is essential to the creation of standard design and operating environments which are necessary to the operation and development of Department of Defense-wide standard systems. Therefore, to support the

Defense efforts to ensure that proposed individual service/defense agency consolidations make good sense, the Committee recommends the combining of fiscal year 1992 funding for ADP consolidation in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence). The Committee also directs the Department to review and validate the associated business cases and economic analyses prior to the release of any funds for consolidations.

The recommended adjustments are as follows:

Operation and maintenance, Army.....	-\$28,600,000
Other procurement, Army.....	-29,000,000
Other procurement, Navy.....	-54,700,000
Other procurement, Air Force.....	-70,400,000
Procurement, defense agencies (DLA).....	-14,000,000
Total.....	-196,700,000

Excessive automated data processing development and modernization program growth.—The fiscal year 1992 budget request for development and modernization of ADP resources is 25 percent greater than the fiscal year 1991 program. This ratio holds true whether the ADP program in question is related to corporate information management [CIM] or not. The Committee is concerned that the services are spending resources on programs that may be considered in the near future as potential CIM candidates for either continuance or termination. Furthermore, this level of growth in the non-CIM area indicates the Department's lack of ability to constrain individual service ADP modernization efforts. The Committee firmly believes that the Department should make every effort to constrain spending in ADP development and modernization for non-CIM-related categories. Accordingly, the Committee recommends reductions of \$49,000,000 for the Army, \$20,000,000 for the Navy, and \$133,000,000 for the Air Force. These reductions are addressed in section 8046 of the general provisions. Furthermore, none of these reductions may be applied to the Army's sustaining base information systems or Reserve component automation system ADP programs or used to impact any other Committee adjustments to these two programs.

ARMY

Sustaining base information system [SBIS].—SBIS is designed to consolidate and integrate base level ADP systems throughout the Army. Preliminary economic analyses indicate that the fielding of SBIS will save the Army several billion dollars through the year 2002. As a result of this preliminary analysis, the Army has identified an urgent requirement to realign \$40,000,000 in fiscal year 1992 resources to ensure that the SBIS program remains on track. The Committee commends the Army's efforts to rein in base level automation costs and the proliferation of duplicative systems. Accordingly, the Committee supports the realignment of \$40,000,000 to support the continued progress in the implementation of SBIS.

Personnel electronic records management system [PERMS].—PERMS is the Army initiative to store and maintain personnel files on an optical imagery system for Active, Guard, and Reserve personnel. The initial contract award was made in April 1991 but

subsequently terminated as a result of a protest. The contract was to be re-awarded in late September 1991, but a second protest has been filed over the re-award date and it is likely that contract award will slip into fiscal year 1992. The contract has been constructed with various options for the conversion of military personnel files that may be exercised either serially or concurrently. Since this effort is still in its early phases, it appears prudent to delay the exercising of the planned fiscal year 1992 option for the conversion of enlisted personnel records [EREC]. Recommended adjustments are detailed below. In addition, funds for the procurement of hardware were erroneously budgeted within the defense business operating fund [DBOF]. The associated adjustments also correct this misplacement of funding.

Operation and maintenance (EREC).....	-\$5,000,000
Operation and maintenance (DBOF correction)	- 7,355,000
Other procurement, Army (DBOF correction)	+ 7,355,000
Other procurement, Army (EREC).....	- 4,062,000
Total.....	-9,062,000

NAVY

Military Sealift Command mobility planning and execution system [MOPEX].—As a result of economies and efficiencies, the Navy was able to realize reductions in the level of travel, leased space, and supply costs related to the operation of MOPEX. In fiscal year 1992, the Navy has requested increases in funding in these accounts. The Committee does not support the requested increases and recommends a reduction of \$1,758,000 to the operation and maintenance, Navy appropriation.

AIR FORCE

Strategic war planning system [SWPS].—SWPS is an automated system used by the Strategic Air Command to plan, disseminate, and implement strategic war plans. Last year, Congress directed that this program be presented to the Major Automated Information Systems Review Council [MAISRC] for review and that the results of this review be presented to Congress. It has come to the attention of this Committee that the designated MAISRC review has not been completed and that the Air Force cannot substantiate the SWPS funding profile, distinguish system operating costs from planned upgrades, or establish program baseline costs. Furthermore, given the altered strategic environment and changes in data sources for SWPS (e.g., OTH-B was to provide data to SWPS, but OTH-B has now been terminated), it is vital that this program be validated and clearly defined as to what efforts are being funded within SWPS. Pending a MAISRC decision on the SWPS program and demonstrated commitment to accurately identifying various program costs, the Committee recommends a reduction of \$29,408,000 to other procurement, Air Force, in fiscal year 1992.

Military Airlift Command command and control information processing system [MACC²IPS].—The fiscal year 1991 Department of Defense Appropriations Act decremented funding for the procurement of MACC²IPS hardware due to slips occurring in soft-

ware development. In addition, the Air Force was directed to present this program to the Major Automated Information Systems Review Council for review. Due to requirements to support Operations Desert Shield/Storm, the MAISRC for this program has slipped several months and will not be completed until some time in fiscal year 1992. While portions of the software were used in Operations Desert Shield/Storm, the deployed portion only represented approximately 80 percent of the software comprising increment 1. Until the MACC²IPS program successfully completes the directed AFAISRC/MAISRC reviews, and the associated issues have been resolved, the Committee recommends a reduction of \$7,200,000 to the other procurement, Air Force appropriation.

Core automated maintenance system [CAMS]/reliability and maintainability information system [REMIS] limitation.—Since 1988, the General Accounting Office [GAO], the Department of Defense inspector general, and military department audit agencies have documented serious deficiencies in the acquisition and management of automated information systems. Such deficiencies assume added significance as they relate to the acquisition and management of weapon system automated information systems because of the leverage conferred by timely, accurate, and comprehensive data and information on the effective and efficient use of resources and in reducing the Defense Department's operations and support cost burden.

The Committee is especially concerned by the Air Force's current actions to continue development and acquisition of programs that offer far less than the required capability and do not provide timely, accurate, and comprehensive information. According to several in-house and independent analyses and audits, CAMS and REMIS cannot provide the quality and data volume needed to manage complex weapons systems and associated warranty programs. In fact, and notwithstanding the higher than anticipated costs realized, there has been a marked deterioration in both the quality and data volume since the introduction of CAMS, as well as a degradation in overall management effectiveness because of the lack of information management capabilities provided by CAMS and REMIS.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends that the CAMS and REMIS programs be terminated and that no funds from any source or appropriation be used to continue the development, acquisition, and fielding of CAMS and REMIS. The Committee further directs the Air Force to use those funds appropriated for ADP systems, including those previously appropriated for CAMS and REMIS, solely for the development, procurement, and operation of a suitable alternative system. With the recent creation of the Air Force Material Command and its emphasis on management by weapons system, it is strongly urged that the Air Force fund, implement, and manage any alternative system(s) through the program offices that have the ultimate responsibility for quality, readiness, and cost control.

DEFENSE AGENCIES

Composite health care system [CHCS].—The Committee has staunchly supported the development of CHCS and recognizes the significant benefits that the Department's medical community will reap from the fielding of this system. Currently, CHCS is undergoing testing at several hospitals and outpatient clinics throughout the Department and preliminary results are very encouraging. The major difficulty in the development of CHCS has occurred in the area of in-patient order entry [IPOE], particularly in its use in intensive care units. Because of this problem, Congress has limited the deployment of CHCS pending full approval for the deployment of CHCS, except in limited cases where it can be demonstrated by an economic analysis that CHCS is necessary to replace current antiquated systems that have been used well beyond their intended life cycle. It has come to the Committee's attention that the Department is splitting CHCS into separate milestone decisions for IPOE and the balance of CHCS, the primary reason being to receive full deployment approval for the basic system before successfully demonstrating that IPOE works. The Committee is disturbed by this action since IPOE is one of the keystones to the successful implementation of CHCS and that without IPOE, the Department is fielding a system not unlike commercial off-the-shelf systems that are available at a more economical value. Should this be done, the Committee is not convinced that the Department will see the rest of the development of CHCS through to fruition. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to conduct its MAISRC reviews of CHCS as a single system. In addition, the Committee directs the Department to specifically earmark \$9,000,000 of its fiscal year 1992 procurement, defense agency funds for the completion of the development of IPOE software and that CHCS not receive MAISRC review and approval until IPOE can be incorporated into such a review. The Committee is not unsympathetic to the fact that there are aging medical systems in the field today that must be replaced for economic reasons. In that vein, the Committee reiterates previous positions taken by Congress that where economically feasible, and through the demonstration that final CHCS software will be able to be fielded, that medical facilities may procure and install current generation CHCS systems, at the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs).

CORPORATE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT [CIM]

In October 1989, the Department of Defense initiated CIM to improve its ability to apply information management capabilities effectively in support of its mission. Since that time the Department has generated a significant amount of guidance concerning the conduct and direction of CIM, including the appointing of a Director of Defense Information who has the authority to develop and manage the implementation, execution, and oversight of CIM principles across the Department of Defense.

In the fiscal year 1991 Department of Defense Appropriations Act, the Congress strongly endorsed the Department's CIM initiative and provided a central account of \$1,000,000,000 from which the Department could administer CIM and apply those funds

toward the most important automated data processing requirements of the Department. Due to the timing of this action, the requirement that for the first time the services and Office of Secretary of Defense staff coordinate the establishment of priorities among the numerous and varied ADP programs, and working with a funding level appropriated at an amount less than requested, led to much confusion within the Department for several months at the onset of this initiative. In discussing the merits of this initiative with various organizations within the Department, several areas of concern were raised. In summary, the main issues were that the time to allocate funds from the central account took too long, that the funds within the central account involved more than just CIM-related programs, and that funding was allocated in such a manner that it did not prevent the use of funds for ADP programs that were not approved for funding.

The President's budget reflects CIM funding as decentralized and controlled primarily by the services. The fundamental issue is whether or not CIM funding in fiscal year 1992 should be centralized again or left as is in the President's request. The crux of this debate lies in whether the issues outlined above can be resolved or if the ability to centralize funding and management of CIM is beyond the skills of the Department. The Committee firmly believes that the experience gained this past year through the centralized management of CIM, that actions taken by the Department to identify fiscal year 1992 priorities, and recommendations of this Committee will greatly enhance the execution and management of CIM from a centralized fund.

The primary reason for the delay in the allocation of funds back to the services was due to the fact that the Department had to establish priorities for all programs to be funded from the central CIM fund. This had never been done before within or without the services and proved to be a formidable task to complete and did not commence until after the fiscal year had begun. For fiscal year 1992, the CIM program office has requested the services to prepare business case analyses for CIM-related efforts and has asked that the services respond to this tasking prior to the start of the fiscal year. This action should put the CIM program office well ahead of their position the previous year in being able to make timely decisions as to which CIM programs should be supported.

The original \$1,000,000,000 CIM account did include funding for programs that were not related to CIM. This inclusion unnecessarily delayed the funding of programs which were not related to CIM and that funding was necessary to provide for system upgrades. Of the fiscal year 1992 budget request, CIM-related operations and modernization funds have been identified to the Committee such that any action to centralize CIM funding should only incorporate CIM-related efforts.

Finally, the allocation of funding during fiscal year 1991 did not provide adequate controls on the use and realignment of funding. Funds were not provided specifically by project and thus, once received by the services, the ability to track the use of these funds by project became very difficult. It is the opinion of the Committee that commencing with fiscal year 1992, CIM centrally managed funds should be allocated through the use of military interdepart-

mental purchase requests [MIPR's]. MIPR's should be used for each individual system effort under CIM. Thus, if funds need to be reallocated among differing projects, programs may be specifically chosen for adjustment rather than relying on the service to make the appropriate adjustment without the assurance that the desired adjustment has taken place or that the lowest priority effort has been decremented.

The Committee firmly believes that the success of CIM relies on the ability of the Department retain CIM-related modernization funds within a central account so that the highest priority systems and those with the greatest economic payback may be pursued expeditiously. In order to provide for the centralized management of CIM programs in fiscal year 1992, the following adjustments are recommended (note that operation and maintenance adjustments include resources associated with revolving fund efforts within CIM):

	Operation and maintenance	Other procurement	Total
Army:			
Standard depot system	-\$997,000		-\$997,000
TAMMIS	-4,742,000	-\$6,100,000	-10,842,000
Corps of Engineers fin. mgmt. sys.	-1,531,000		-1,531,000
Total, Army	-7,270,000	-6,100,000	-13,370,000
Navy:			
Civilian time and attendance	-19,000	-300,000	-319,000,000
NCPDS	-38,000,000		-38,000,000
Automated storage kitering sys.	-560,000		-560,000
LOGMARS	-5,004,000		-5,004,000
SPLICE	-3,588,000		-3,588,000
Stock point ADP replacement	-20,286,000		-20,286,000
Financial operations NCSC		-250,000	-250,000
MIS David Taylor Research Center	-324,000		-324,000
NAVAIR industrial fund mgmt. sys.		-425,000	-425,000
NWSES standard industrial fund	-163,000		-163,000
Naval ordnance MIS	-4,000		-4,000
Printing resources MIS	-257,000		-257,000
Reserve fin. mgmt./active duty	-641,000		-641,000
Automated proc. and acct. sys.	-495,000	-729,000	-1,224,000
ICP—Resolicitation	-3,909,000		-3,909,000
SCLSIS	-310,000		-310,000
Computer-assisted medical IVS	-2,068,000		-2,068,000
Expense assignment sys.—V. III		-1,125,000	-1,125,000
Medical office automation		-2,550,000	-2,550,000
UADPS level II	-350,000		-350,000
UADPS stock points	-428,000		-428,000
Total, Navy	-38,444,000	-5,379,000	-43,823,000
Air Force:			
Base level personnel system	-292,000		-292,000
Personnel concepts III		-1,399,000	-1,399,000
Std., cataloging, and prov. sys.	-3,357,000		-3,357,000
Equipment mgmt. system (AFEMS)	-9,205,000		-9,205,000
Initial provisioning MIS	-1,000,000		-1,000,000
Mod. of def. log. standard sys.	-1,774,000		-1,774,000
REMIS	-11,796,000		-11,796,000
Requirements data bank	-23,836,000	-2,290,000	-26,126,000
Weapon system MIS		-802,000	-802,000
Contractor data management sys.	-8,726,000		-8,726,000

	Operation and maintenance	Other procurement	Total
Total, Air Force.....	- 59,986,000	- 4,491,000	- 64,477,000
Defense Agencies:			
DCA DECCO AIS.....	- 1,000,000	- 1,500,000	- 2,500,000
DFAS military pay redesign—JSS.....	- 8,917,000		- 8,917,000
DFAS program, budget, and acct. sys.....	- 1,378,000		- 1,378,000
DFAS std. Army FI&RS—Mod.....	- 3,644,000		- 3,644,000
DFAS std. Army civ. pay sys.—Re.....	- 5,294,000		- 5,294,000
DFAS st finance system—Re.....	- 21,359,000		- 21,359,000
DLA std. automated trans. sys.....	- 980,000		- 980,000
DLA DRMS AIS.....	- 8,740,000		- 8,740,000
DLA def. automated address sys.....	- 12,453,000		- 12,453,000
DLA DLIS—modernization program.....	- 13,563,000		- 13,563,000
DLA defense distribution system.....	- 4,672,000		- 4,672,000
DLA DIPEC.....	- 118,000		- 118,000
DLA APCAPS.....	- 2,470,000		- 2,470,000
DLA BOSS.....	- 425,000		- 425,000
DLA DFAMS.....	- 2,314,000		- 2,314,000
DLA DISMS.....	- 6,428,000		- 6,428,000
DLA MOCAS.....	- 12,001,000		- 12,001,000
DLA SAMMS.....	- 27,018,000		- 27,018,000
DMSSC AQCESS.....	- 8,851,000	- 14,600,000	- 23,451,000
DMSSC CHCS.....	- 6,410,000	- 28,700,000	- 35,110,000
DMSSC DSS.....	- 9,100,000	- 4,700,000	- 13,800,000
DMSSC DBMIS—BI.....	- 4,522,000		- 4,522,000
DMSSC DBMIS—DB.....	- 122,000		- 122,000
DMSSC DDS.....	- 1,925,000		- 1,925,000
DMSSC DMIS.....	- 3,511,000		- 3,511,000
DMSSC DMLS.....	- 1,937,000		- 1,937,000
DMSSC DTS.....	- 2,903,000		- 2,903,000
DMSSC EAS version III.....	- 3,930,000		- 3,930,000
Total, defense agencies.....	- 175,985,000	- 49,500,000	- 225,485,000
Grand total.....	- 281,685,000	- 65,470,000	- 347,155,000

In addition to the above systems, additional systems have been identified as CIM-related systems but do not have any fiscal year 1992 funds budgeted for modernization. These systems should not receive any funding for modernization efforts in fiscal year 1992 unless specifically approved by the Director for Defense Information and funded from within the CIM central account or identified elsewhere in the centrally funded CIM system. These systems are:

Army

Army civilian personnel system
 Army Material Command accounting system
 Integrated procurement system
 Composite health care system
 Medical expense reporting system
 Occupational health management information system modernization
 Commodity command support system (other)

Navy

NAVAIR depot workload control system
 Financial operations system—NUSC
 Financial operations system—NWS

Navy headquarters financial system
 Program support data automated report and tracking system
 Uniform ADP system—Inventory control points
 Standard accounting and reporting system
 Marine Corps standard supply system

Air Force

Enhanced transportation automated data system
 Stock control and distribution
 Engineering data computer retrieval system
 Initial provisioning management information system
 Joint uniformed services technical information system
 Dental data system
 Inpatient data system
 Medical expense and performance reporting system
 Medical logistics system
 Report of patients
 Surgeon General quality of life (HQ USAF)
 Standard appointment and scheduling system

Defense agencies

DCA—Defense commercial communications office automated information system
 DFAS—Interim integrated and disbursing and accounting
 DFAS—Central procurement accounting system
 DMSSC—Central processing and distribution system
 DMSSC—Defense enrollment eligibility system
 DMSSC—Defense medical regulating information system
 DMSSC—SNAP automated medical systems
 DMSSC—Triservice food
 DMSSC—Triservice micro pharmacy system

Automated data processing operations consolidations.—The Committee has recommended, elsewhere in this report, that ADP operations consolidation funding in fiscal year 1992 be centralized within the Corporate Information Management Office in the amount of \$196,700,000. The Committee is concerned that the individual service ADP consolidation plans are falling behind schedule and still have significant levels of planning and review to accomplish prior to being able to wisely utilize these funds for consolidation efforts. Given the current stage of development of these plans, the Committee does not believe that these consolidations are fully executable in fiscal year 1992 and, therefore, recommends a reduction of \$75,000,000 without prejudice. The Committee supports the Department's efforts to consolidate ADP operations where resources may be saved, but cautions the Department that credible, well-developed consolidation plans must be established prior to the use of these funds.

Computer-aided Acquisition and Logistics Support Program [CALS].—Last year the Congress consolidated CALS funding and directed the Department to conduct a review of CALS projects and systems and select standards for the Department. The Department provided an interim status of this review and has recently concluded its review. The Committee strongly supports the consolidation of

CALS funding in fiscal year 1992 in order that the Department may effectively manage and direct the implementation of this critical effort. Accordingly, the Committee recommends the following adjustments necessary to centralize CALS funding within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Production and Logistics):

	O&M	Procurement	R&D	Total
Army:				
ACALS				
FCIM	-\$7,000,000			-\$7,000,000
TD/CMS	-6,800,000			-6,800,000
DSREDS	-6,000,000			-6,000,000
Army, total	-19,800,000			-19,800,000
Navy:				
CAD II	-2,600,000	-\$14,600,000		-17,200,000
AIM-TRAIN				
AIM-NSYS				
DRWG PROC		-25,000,000		-25,000,000
EDPODS II				
NEDALS				
NPODS	-1,700,000			-1,700,000
Snap III				
TMPODS				
EDMICS	-5,900,000			-5,900,000
SPLICE	-3,600,000			-3,600,000
APADE	-500,000	-700,000		-1,200,000
IOSS/RAMP	-10,500,000		-\$4,400,000	-14,900,000
Navy, total	-24,800,000	-40,300,000	-4,400,000	-69,500,000
Air Force:				
JUSTIS				
ABDR			-500,000	-500,000
Spares				
LSMIS	-100,000	-900,000		-1,000,000
CADBIT			-300,000	-300,000
IDS			-600,000	-600,000
Crew chief			-900,000	-900,000
DMAMTI	-2,500,000			-2,500,000
ITDS				
ATOS	-4,500,000			-4,500,000
CALS	-27,000,000			-27,000,000
IMIS			-7,400,000	-7,400,000
EIP				
RAMTIP			-20,999,000	-20,999,000
EDCARS	-5,400,000	-1,400,000		-6,800,000
Air Force, total	-39,500,000	-2,300,000	-30,699,000	-72,499,000
OSD:				
CALS			-10,475,000	-10,475,000
ACALS	-26,500,000	-18,500,000		-45,000,000
Spares			-2,600,000	-2,600,000
EIP			-2,000,000	-2,000,000
JUSTIS	-20,600,000	-5,400,000		-26,000,000
OSD total	-47,100,000	-23,900,000	-15,075,000	-86,075,000
Grand total	-131,200,000	-66,500,000	-50,174,000	-247,874,000

Section 8049 of the general provisions addresses the reallocation of funding associated with the consolidation of CIM, ADP operations, and CALS.

PAN CARBON FIBER

Public Law 100-202, enacted in 1987, contains a provision that directs DOD to procure 50 percent of its polyacrylonitrile [PAN] carbon fiber from domestic sources by 1992. This provision was passed to insure that the United States had the capability to produce PAN carbon fiber independent of foreign sources.

The Committee continues to be concerned about the lack of utilization of domestic PAN precursor by the Department of Defense and the failure to meet the goals established by the public law and departmental regulations. The Committee supports the Department's plan to use 100-percent carbon fibers made from domestic PAN for all weapon systems not yet in production, but believes that any further delays in the requirements to use domestic PAN on current production programs will seriously effect the economic viability of the U.S. PAN industry which supports the manufacture of carbon fibers.

Because of the need to establish a viable United States PAN carbon fiber industry, the Committee reemphasizes the requirement of Public Law 100-202 which requires that, by 1992, at least 50 percent of the DOD's requirement for PAN carbon fiber be fulfilled by procuring carbon fibers manufactured from domestic PAN. In addition, the Committee recommends that DOD increase the procurement of carbon fibers made from domestic PAN in all current weapon systems with the goal of exceeding 75 percent by fiscal year 1995.

The Committee directs DOD to prepare and submit to the Committee by June 1, 1992, an implementation plan showing how DOD will satisfy the requirements of Public Law 100-202, as well as, the Department's plans for increasing the procurement of carbon fiber from domestic PAN to 75 percent by fiscal year 1995.

Qualitative edge.—The Committee believes the United States should endeavor to ensure the maintenance of Israel's qualitative military edge. This edge is dependent upon superiority in each of at least three areas: technology, tactical/strategic intelligence, and operational capability.

The Committee is concerned that Israel's qualitative edge may erode as a result of the escalating arms race in the Middle East and the increasing cost of advanced weapons. In response to this erosion in Israel's military capability, the United States must make every effort to provide Israel with the technologies needed to ensure deterrence or, in the event of war, victory at the least possible cost.

The Committee calls upon the President to ensure that Israel's qualitative military edge, relative to its regional adversaries, is maintained.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Appropriations, 1991	\$1,096,182,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,667,700,000
House allowance	1,730,787,000
Committee recommendation	1,640,200,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,640,200,000, a decrease of \$27,500,000 from the budget request and \$90,587,000 below the House allowance.

This appropriation finances the acquisition of tactical and utility helicopters and airplanes, including associated electronics and communications equipment and armament; modification and modernization of in-service aircraft; flight simulators; ground support equipment; production base support; and components and repair parts including transmissions and gear boxes.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The Army's aviation budget request has only minor modifications from previous plans. While the Army still intends to terminate the Apache and AHIP programs, it has resuscitated the UH-60 Black Hawk program and reiterated its support to arm the existing OH-58D helicopters. The Committee has endorsed the approach offered by the Army. The Committee recommendations account for changes related to Desert Storm supplemental funding. In addition, the adjustments will strengthen Army National Guard and Reserves by diverting savings to needed programs supporting Reserve forces. Finally, the Committee has reviewed programs from a cost-effectiveness point of view and offers adjustments where appropriate. The Committee's proposed adjustments are listed in the table below and described in the text which follows.

[in thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY												
AIRCRAFT												
FIXED WING												
C-23.....	6	189,505		6	189,505		10	60,000		+60,000	+10	+60,000
GUARDRAIL COMMON SENSOR (TIARA).....							6	189,505				
TRACTOR HALL.....		299			299							
ROTARY												
TOTAL PACKAGE FELDING.....		1,442						1,442				+1,442
AH-64 ATTACK HELICOPTER (APACHE) (MYP).....		142,066			138,066					-4,000		
LIGHT HELICOPTER FAMILY.....												
UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP).....	60	334,178		60	334,178		47	250,778		-83,400	-13	-83,400
UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) (AP-CY).....		173,300			173,300			173,300				
TRAINING HELICOPTER.....							40	23,500		+23,500	+40	+23,500
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT.....		840,790			835,348			836,890		-3,900		+1,542
MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT												
TRACTOR DEV.....		200			200			200				
OV-1 MODS SURVEILLANCE AIRPLANE (TIARA).....												
GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA).....		31,936			31,936							
RU-21 MODS (TIARA).....												
AH-1S MODS.....		3,445			3,445			3,445				
AH-64 MODS.....		82,771			82,771			82,771				+82,771
C-23 MODS.....								16,000		+16,000		+16,000
CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER (MODS) (MYP).....		256,877			256,877							
CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER (MODS) (AP-CY).....												
OH-58 MODS.....		21,934			21,934							
FLIGHT DATA RECORDER.....		499			499							
UH-1 MODS.....		9,166			14,166							-5,000
UH-60 MODS.....		34,837			34,837							
ARMED OH-58D.....		183,244			183,244					-44,600		-44,600
AH-1P.....		6,299		36	200,000							-200,000
EH-60 HELICOPTER MODS.....					6,299							
AIRBORNE AVIONICS.....												
ASE MODS.....		19,045			19,045							
RETIREMENT OF OBSOLETE AIRCRAFT.....												
MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$2.0M.....		13,900						13,900				+13,900

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

UH-60 Black Hawk.—The Committee recommends \$250,778,000 for purchase of 47 UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters. This amount is \$83,400,000 and 13 helicopters below the budget request and the House allowance. The Army intends to enter into a multiyear contract for 60 UH-60's per year beginning in fiscal year 1992. The Desert Storm supplemental request includes funding for 13 Black Hawks to replace those lost during the hostilities in the Persian Gulf. The Committee intends to provide funding in the supplemental to purchase these helicopters. The Committee believes that this action will offset the need to purchase the total number requested for fiscal year 1992.

UH-1 training helicopter replacement.—In fiscal year 1991, the Army received approval to enter into a long-term arrangement to lease commercial helicopters to replace its current aging UH-1 training helicopters. The House expressed its concern with the cost effectiveness of this approach. It recommended the repeal of this authority and directed the Army to review its plan. The Army has informed the Committee that its review indicates that purchase of commercial off-the-shelf helicopters would, in fact, be a less costly alternative for the Government. Therefore, the Committee believes the Army should proceed to purchase replacement helicopters. To that end, \$23,500,000 is recommended for the Army to purchase 40 off-the-shelf helicopters for training. The Army currently estimates it will require 157 helicopters for this program; however, the Committee believes this may be overstated due to planned and potential force structure cuts. The Committee directs the Army to review its total requirement based on its force structure plans and budget for the required additional helicopter purchases beginning in fiscal year 1993. The Committee wants to make it clear that it does not intend to approve funding for leasing instead of purchasing for this requirement.

C-23 Sherpa.—The Committee recommends \$76,000,000 for C-23 Sherpa aircraft. The Committee directs that \$60,000,000 shall be used to purchase 10 retrofitted aircraft for the Army National Guard which conform with a C-23 aircraft type specification. An additional \$16,000,000 is provided to refurbish eight C-23 aircraft for the Army.

Army Helicopter Improvement Program [AHIP].—The budget requests \$183,200,000 for arming 28 existing AHIP helicopters. Included in the request is \$44,600,000 for costs associated with terminating the AHIP Program. The Desert Storm supplemental requests funding to replace 12 OH-58 helicopters lost during the Persian Gulf hostilities with new AHIP helicopters. As such, the funds to cover the termination of the AHIP line is premature. Therefore, the Committee recommends \$138,600,000 for this program, a decrease of \$44,600,000 from the budget request. The House recommendation adds \$200,000,000 to purchase an additional 36 new AHIP's. The Committee believes this unjustified and unrequested add on is excessive in light of current inventories and Desert Storm funding.

AH-64 modifications.—The Committee recommends \$82,771,000 for AH-64 modifications, as requested. The House provided no

funding for this program noting that the Army plan did not respond to previous congressional concerns regarding reliability and maintainability. The Army has reconsidered its program and the current plan successfully addresses these criticisms. The Committee is concerned that the Army plan would initiate a new upgrade program, the AH-64C, to begin in fiscal year 1993, but the Army does not plan to request funding for this program. The Committee wants it to be clear that it will be unlikely to support the AH-64C program unless funding is requested by the Department of Defense in its fiscal year 1993 budget.

External fuel tanks.—The Committee recommendation provides \$5,000,000 for the Army to purchase external fuel tanks for Army National Guard helicopters. This item was not addressed in the budget or House allowance.

Other authorization adjustments.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$4,000,000 from the AH-64 program, the same as the House and assumed in the Senate-passed authorization bill.

Other House adjustments.—The Committee does not concur with the following recommendations of the House: Total package fielding (–\$39,800,000); and modifications under \$2,000,000 (–\$13,900,000).

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Appropriations, 1991	\$2,218,422,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,035,800,000
House allowance	1,109,595,000
Committee recommendation	1,009,456,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,009,456,000, a decrease of \$26,344,000 below the President's budget request and \$100,139,000 below the House allowance.

This appropriation finances the procurement, production, modification, and modernization of surface-to-air and surface-to-surface missile systems; air defense control and coordination systems; anti-tank/assault missile systems; and related support and production base equipment.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendation in comparison to the President's amended budget request and the House-passed bill:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	QTY.	Amount	QTY.	QTY.	Amount	QTY.	QTY.	Amount	QTY.	Budget amount	House amount	House amount
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY												
OTHER MISSILES												
SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM												
CHAPARRAL SYSTEM SUMMARY	--	6,819	--	--	6,819	--	--	6,819	--	--	--	--
LOS-F-H SYSTEM SUMMARY	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
HAUK SYSTEM SUMMARY	--	1,647	--	--	1,647	--	--	1,647	--	--	--	--
OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT	--	596	--	--	596	--	--	596	--	--	--	--
PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY (MYP)	--	107,052	--	--	107,052	--	--	78,052	--	-29,000	--	-29,000
STINGER SYSTEM SUMMARY	--	37,526	--	1,800	112,526	--	--	26,226	--	-11,300	--	-86,300
AVENGER SYSTEM SUMMARY	144	127,418	144	144	127,418	144	--	127,418	--	--	--	--
AVENGER SYSTEM SUMMARY (AP-CY)	--	52,700	--	--	52,700	--	--	52,700	--	--	--	--
AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM												
LASER HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	112	19,697	112	112	19,697	112	--	19,697	--	--	--	--
ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM												
ADV ANTI-TANK LPNS SYS MED (AAVS-M) SYS	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ADV ANTI-TANK LPNS SYS MED (AAVS-M) SYS SUM (AP-CY)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOM 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	10,000	200,578	10,000	10,000	200,578	10,000	--	200,578	--	--	--	--
MULTIPLE LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (MYP)	--	2,111	--	16	58,000	--	--	61,700	--	+59,589	--	+3,700
MLRS ROCKET (AP-CY)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MLRS LAUNCHER	43	178,233	43	43	153,733	43	--	136,600	--	-41,633	--	-17,133
MLRS LAUNCHER (AP-CY)	--	3,000	--	--	3,000	--	--	3,000	--	--	--	--
ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACHS) - SYS SUM	300	150,928	300	300	146,928	300	--	146,928	--	-4,000	--	--
ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACHS) - SYS SUM (AP-CY)	--	23,985	--	--	23,985	--	--	23,985	--	--	--	--
TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES		912,290			1,014,679			885,946		-26,344		-128,733
MODIFICATION OF MISSILES												
MODIFICATIONS												
PATRIOT MODS.	--	35,505	--	--	35,505	--	--	35,505	--	--	--	--
CHAPARRAL MODS.	--	462	--	--	462	--	--	462	--	--	--	--
HAUK MODS.	--	10,019	--	--	10,019	--	--	10,019	--	--	--	--
AVENGER MODS.	--	7,772	--	--	7,772	--	--	7,772	--	--	--	--
TOM MODS.	--	8,263	--	--	8,263	--	--	8,263	--	--	--	--
MLRS MODS.	--	36,934	--	--	36,934	--	--	36,934	--	--	--	--

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

OTHER MISSILES

Patriot missile system.—The Army requested \$107,052,000 within the fiscal year 1992 amended budget request for the procurement of Patriot support equipment and to provide associated technical engineering support. The Committee recommends \$78,052,000 for Patriot procurement and technical support, a reduction of \$29,000,000 from the amended budget request and the House allowance.

The General Accounting Office [GAO] has reported that \$29,000,000 of the amended budget request could be reduced by the Committee because of restructured requirements and late fiscal year 1991 contract awards. According to GAO, Army program management officials have reassessed the fiscal year 1992 budget requirements for program support items by making the following deletions or reductions: (1) \$3,500,000 for peculiar support equipment, (2) \$2,000,000 for training software, and (3) \$1,500,000 for project administration.

The Army's fiscal year 1992 request also includes \$8,100,000 to upgrade fielded fire units to the configuration currently being produced. Congress provided \$7,900,000 in fiscal year 1991 for the first year of this 2-year modification effort. However, according to the General Accounting Office, because of delays caused by Operations Desert Shield/Storm, the contractor will not complete modification development in time to award the first production contract in fiscal year 1991. Therefore, the Committee recommends that the Army use fiscal year 1991 funds to begin this modification effort in fiscal year 1992, thus eliminating the need for the \$8,100,000 requested in fiscal year 1992.

The Army's request further includes \$10,000,000 for the procurement of 395 emplacement modification kits and \$18,000,000 for the procurement of 300 north-finding modules. The GAO reports that the Army intends to slip the fiscal year 1991 contract for the procurement of 202 emplacement kits until March 1992 when a fully capable kit will be available. The Committee agrees with the Army's decision to procure only fully capable kits and expects the Army to wait until the fully capable kits are ready for procurement before obligating any funds. The Committee provides \$2,700,000 of the \$10,000,000 requested, and when combined with available prior year funds, will allow the procurement of 299 emplacement kits in fiscal year 1992. The Committee further provides \$11,400,000 of the \$18,000,000 requested for north-finding modules, which when combined with available prior year funds will procure 299 in fiscal year 1992.

Stinger missile.—The Army requested \$37,526,000 within the fiscal year 1992 amended budget request to provide training facility improvements, training missiles, and engineering and administrative support for the Stinger missile system. The Committee recommends \$26,226,000 for these activities, a reduction of \$11,300,000 from the budget request and \$83,300,000 below the House allowance.

The General Accounting Office has reported that the Army has decided to modify only 5 of the 10 facilities that were budgeted for within this request. The Army estimates the cost for improving each facility at \$1,900,000 and, therefore, the excess \$9,500,000 is denied. The GAO has further reported that the Army included \$1,800,000 for the procurement of 2,184 training missiles to satisfy fiscal year 1993 requirements. The Committee denies these funds and directs the Army to budget for these missiles in fiscal year 1993.

Laser Hellfire missile.—The Army's amended budget request contains \$19,697,000 for the procurement of 112 next generation Hellfire optimized missile systems [HOMS].

The Committee notes that Congress appropriated \$86,600,000 within the Desert Shield/Storm supplemental for the procurement of 3,170 basic laser Hellfire missiles with the improved warhead. The Committee has also been advised that it is the Army's intent to use \$40,000,000 from the special defense acquisition fund [SDAF] to procure an additional 1,200 basic laser Hellfire missiles in fiscal year 1991. These funds are additive to the \$106,279,000 appropriated within the fiscal year 1991 Defense bill for the procurement of 3,002 basic laser Hellfire missiles.

With the Army's desires to begin production and deployment of the HOMS in late fiscal year 1992, the Committee does not see the wisdom of continued production of basic Hellfire missiles in fiscal years 1991 and 1992 beyond the minimum economic rate of 230 missiles per month. The fiscal year 1991 basic laser Hellfire missile contract for 3,170 combined with a priced option for 2,374 missiles are sufficient to gap the production line of the old producer until the new producer begins rate production of the next generation HOMS.

The Army also desires to use approximately \$23,800,000 from funds provided within the Desert Shield/Storm supplemental to procure up to 335 additional HOMS in fiscal year 1992 if the new producer has finished development and can handle the additional production. The Committee supports the Army's plans, however, directs that the Army can only use these funds to procure HOMS and that none of these funds shall be used to procure any additional basic Hellfire missiles.

MLRS rockets.—The President's amended budget request contains \$2,111,000 to terminate missile production and to maintain warm base for future production capability for the multiple launch rocket system [MLRS] rocket assemblies. The Committee recommends \$61,700,000, an increase to the budget request of \$59,589,000 and \$3,700,000 more than provided by the House.

The Committee notes that Congress provided \$151,900,000 within the fiscal year 1991 Desert Shield/Storm supplemental for replacement of stocks used in Southwest Asia. This supplemental funding, when combined with the Committee's fiscal year 1992 recommendation, will allow the Army to adhere to the terms and conditions of the currently negotiated multiyear contract, thus maintaining the favorable multiyear rocket unit price and at the same time, saving money within the MLRS launcher procurement program.

MLRS launcher.—The President's amended fiscal year 1992 budget request contains \$178,233,000 in procurement and

\$3,000,000 in advance procurement for the purchase of 43 multiple launch rocket system launchers in fiscal year 1992. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$136,600,000 in procurement and \$3,000,000 in advance procurement for the procurement of 43 MLRS launchers, a reduction of \$41,633,000 from the amended budget request.

The Army's missile justification book states that the requested level of funding for MLRS launchers was based on the assumption that the multiyear contract would be terminated at the end of the fiscal year 1991 production and the Army would award a renegotiated contract for launchers only. Since the Committee has provided sufficient rocket funding to continue the multiyear contract pricing in fiscal year 1992, there will be no need to renegotiate the launcher contract.

Army tactical missile system [ATACMS].—The Army has requested \$150,928,000 in procurement and \$23,985,000 in advance procurement for the first year of a multiyear purchase of 300 missiles and associated engineering and support services in fiscal year 1992.

The General Accounting Office has reported to the Committee that the Army has overstated the funding requirements for fuzes by \$4,000,000. The Committee recommends these funds be denied.

The Committee has also included language within the general provisions of the bill authorizing multiyear procurement authority for the Army tactical missile system. The Committee understands the proposed 3-year (1992-94) multiyear procurement of 1,054 missiles has the potential to save the Government \$55,500,000 or 12.1 percent over annual contract for the same quantities.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

Appropriations, 1991	\$2,172,021,000
Budget estimate, 1992	839,100,000
House allowance	1,084,813,000
Committee recommendation	1,003,096,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,003,096,000, an increase of \$163,996,000 above the President's budget request and \$81,717,000 below the House allowance.

This appropriation provides for the procurement of tanks, armored personnel carriers, and combat engineer vehicles. Funds are also provided for the acquisition of crew-served weapons, grenade launchers, towed and self-propelled guns and howitzers, mortars, laser rangefinders, associated training equipment, modification of in-service equipment, initial spares and repair parts, major components, and production base support.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendations in comparison to the President's amended budget request and the House-passed bill:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
PROCUREMENT OF MATCV, ARMY												
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES												
BRADLEY FIGHTING VEHICLE FAMILY (MYP).....	--	109,104		--	109,104		--	109,104		--	--	--
M1 ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES.....	--	7,989		--	7,989		--	7,989		--	--	--
ARMORED GUN SYSTEM (AGS).....	--	--		--	--		--	3,000		+3,000	--	+3,000
M1 ABRAMS TANK SERIES (MYP).....	--	43,744		60	90,044		--	90,044		+46,300	-60	--
M1 ABRAMS TANK SERIES (MYP) (AP-CY).....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
FAASV.....	--	--		80	60,000		--	--		--	-80	-60,000
MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES												
CARRIER, MOD.....	--	5,700		--	5,700		--	5,700		--	--	--
BFVS SERIES (MOD).....	--	185,494		--	185,494		--	110,494		-75,000	--	-75,000
HOMITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109 SER(MOD).....	--	161,006		--	127,006		--	130,006		-31,600	--	+3,000
HOMITZER, MED SP 155(MOD)M109A5.....	--	22,088		--	22,088		--	22,088		--	--	--
FAASV PIP TO FLEET.....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD).....	--	79,664		--	79,664		--	79,664		--	--	--
M-1 UPGRADE PROGRAM.....	--	--		--	225,000		--	225,000		+225,000	--	--
MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$2.0M (TCV-MTCV).....	--	1,017		--	1,017		--	1,017		--	--	--
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES												
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (TCV-MTCV).....	--	203		--	203		--	203		--	--	--
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-MTCV).....	--	73,287		--	63,000		--	63,000		-10,287	--	--
REGIONAL MAINTENANCE TRAINING SITES-EQUIP.....	--	590		--	590		--	590		--	--	--
TOTAL, TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES.....	--	690,486		--	976,899		--	847,899		+157,413	--	-129,000
WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES												
HOMITZER, LIGHT, TOWED, 105MM, M119.....	86	36,420		86	36,420		86	36,420		--	--	--
MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW).....	2,316	5,785		2,316	5,785		2,316	5,785		--	--	--
GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3.....	--	--		841	13,100		--	16,600		+16,600	+225	+3,500
LAUNCHER, SHOCK GRENADE.....	1,637	1,097		1,637	1,097		1,637	1,097		--	--	--
MORTAR, 120MM.....	433	27,197		433	27,197		433	27,197		--	--	--
M16 RIFLE.....	53,575	24,052		53,575	24,052		53,575	24,052		--	--	--
5.56 CARBINE XM4.....	10,000	5,027		10,000	5,027		10,000	5,027		--	--	--
PERSONAL DEFENSE WEAPON, 9MM.....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
PDW 9MM SUB COMPACT.....	--	1,910		--	1,910		--	1,910		--	--	--
VEN RAPID FIRE WPN SYS-BUSHMASTER (MYP).....	4,080	1,910		4,080	1,910		4,080	1,910		--	--	--
MODIFICATION OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT												
SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (MOD).....	--	2,413		--	2,413		--	2,413		--	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget		House		Committee recommendation		Senate compared to--	
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Budget amount	House amount
M16 RIFLE MODS.....	--	4,625	--	4,625	--	4,625	--	--
MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$2.0M (WOCV-WTCV).....	--	635	--	635	--	635	--	--
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES								
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	--	3,376	--	3,376	--	3,376	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (WOCV-WTCV).....	--	26,572	--	26,572	--	21,057	-5,515	-5,515
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV).....	--	8,902	--	8,902	--	7,200	-1,702	-1,702
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS.....	--	148,614	--	161,714	--	157,997	+9,383	-3,717
TOTAL, WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES.....								
	--	--	--	-3,300	--	--	--	+3,300
DBOF ADJUSTMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	-1,100	-1,100	-1,100
DBOF DENY MILCON CAPITAL BUDGET.....	--	--	--	--	--	-1,700	-1,700	-1,700
DBOF TECHNICAL CORRECTION.....	--	--	--	-50,500	--	--	--	+50,500
TOTAL PACKAGE FIELDING.....								
	--	839,100	--	1,084,813	--	1,003,096	+163,996	-81,717
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF WTCV, ARMY.....								

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES

M-1 Abrams tank upgrade program.—The Army requested no funding within the amended fiscal year 1992 budget request for the congressionally directed M-1 series tank upgrade program. The Committee recommends \$225,000,000 in advance procurement funds and provides direction to the Army to begin a M-1 series tank upgrade program, the same as the House allowance and the Senate authorization.

The Committee is disappointed that it must reiterate its direction to the Department of Defense to expeditiously begin a M-1 series tank upgrade program. It should be noted that, with this report, all defense committees in their respective fiscal year 1992 reports have, once again, provided appropriate funding and direction to the Department of Defense to commence a M-1 tank upgrade program immediately. Congress could not be more clear and expects the Department to comply.

While the Committee is in full support of an upgrade program, it continues to question the Armed Services Committee's desires to upgrade the M-1 series tank to the M-1A2 configuration. The Army's estimate of the total cost of the proposed M-1A2 upgrade through the year 2000 is \$9,100,000,000 for 1,920 tanks and the associated recurring and nonrecurring operating costs. The Committee must highlight that the total cost of a similar upgrade program to the M-1A1 configuration is \$4,400,000,000, less than one-half the cost of the M-1A2 upgrades. It should also be noted that neither of these options are currently in the Army's future years defense program [FYDP]. Thus, in order to comply with congressional direction, the Army must either (1) reduce other programs in an already constrained budget or (2) it must secure an increased budget allocation from the Office of the Secretary of Defense to pay for this program. Either option will be difficult to achieve and will require re-prioritization of requirements within a fixed defense topline.

The Committee believes that the primary objective of the upgrade program is to keep the tank industrial base warm during the period of development of the next generation tank, the block III. The secondary objective is to improve the warfighting capability of the deployed force. While the Committee concedes that the proposed M-1A2 tank will be more operationally effective than the M-1A1, the Committee must question paying twice as much for this increase in effectiveness for what is an interim improvement. The Committee also notes that formal reviews of the performance of the M-1A1 tank in Operation Desert Storm have concluded that it was a stellar performer. According to an assessment by a team from the Army's Armored Systems Modernization Office, the M-1A1 dominated the armor battle. First round hits at 3,000 meters were the norm and it is the understanding of the Committee that no M-1A1 tank was penetrated by an Iraqi weapon. The conclusion of many experts and users alike is that the M-1A1 tank is the best tank in the world today and will certainly be highly effective until the block III tank is fielded.

It is the opinion of the Committee that, because of our severe budget constraints, the Army should proceed with a M-1A1 upgrade program and forgo the M-1A2 option. The Committee regretably cannot support an estimated \$9,100,000,000 program as the preferred option for saving our tank industrial base when there is a viable alternative at one-half the cost. The Committee will, however, keep an open mind to a modified M-1A1 upgrade program which may justify the inclusion of some of the M-1A2 improvements at an affordable price.

Production base support [TCV-WTCV].—The Army has requested \$73,287,000 for tracked combat vehicle production base support in fiscal year 1992. The Committee recommends \$63,000,000 for this activity in fiscal year 1992, a reduction of \$10,287,000 from the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

The Army budgeted \$10,287,000 for equipment which was shipped from depot maintenance facilities to equip facilities for the Army Support Group [ASG] in Saudi Arabia in support of Operations Desert Shield/Storm. The Committee denies this request and directs the Army to either return the depot equipment from Saudi Arabia to the facilities or fund the replacement of this equipment from the Defense Cooperation Account specifically established to fund for the incremental costs of Operations Desert Shield/Storm.

WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES

Grenade launcher, auto, 40 mm, MK-19-3.—The Army requested no funding for the 40 mm MK-19-3 grenade launcher within their fiscal year 1992 amended budget request. The Committee provides \$16,600,000 for the procurement of 1,066 systems in fiscal year 1992. This amount is \$3,500,000 above the House allowance.

Production base support [WOCV-WTCV].—The Army has requested \$26,572,000 for the establishment, modernization, expansion, and replacement of equipment and real property owned by the Army and used in production, production testing, and depot level maintenance of weapons and combat vehicles. The Committee recommends \$21,057,000 for these activities in fiscal year 1992, \$5,515,000 below the budget request and the House allowance.

In fiscal year 1992, the Army wants to initiate a major investment in productivity enhancements at Rock Island Arsenal. While the Committee supports efforts to improve efficiencies at Army arsenals, the Committee questions such a major investment at an arsenal where the workload will continue to decrease in relation to the major decline in the Army's budget over the next 5 years. The Committee requests that, prior to any investment in productivity enhancements at Rock Island Arsenal, the Army provide a return on investment analysis for these enhancements based upon a realistic estimate of workload, total overhead, and equipment and portions of the plants which are no longer or will no longer be required for active production but are being retained for potential future use.

Industrial preparedness.—The amended budget request includes \$8,902,000 to retain, protect, and maintain laidaway reserve industrial plants and equipment. The Committee recommends \$7,200,000

for this effort in fiscal year 1992, a reduction of \$1,702,000 below the amended budget request and the House allowance.

This reduction is for unexplained cost growth in this activity. The Army has traditionally funded this effort at approximately \$7,200,000 per year. Further, budget justification books show out-year budget requests through fiscal year 1997 funded at this same level. The Committee has not received information to explain the spike in funding in fiscal year 1992.

OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends incorporating the following adjustments to the budget estimate, in accordance with the Senate authorization action:

(In thousands of dollars)

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Armored gun system.....			3,000	+ 3,000	+ 3,000
M-1 Abrams series tank [MYP].....	43,744	90,044	90,044	+ 46,300	
Bradley IFV mods.....	185,494	185,494	110,494	- 75,000	- 75,000
Howitzer, med SP 155 mm M-109 (mod).....	161,606	127,006	130,006	- 31,600	+ 3,000
DBOF deny Milcon capital budget.....			- 1,100	- 1,100	- 1,100
DBOF technical correction.....			- 1,700	- 1,700	- 1,700

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

Appropriations, 1991	\$1,367,549,000
Budget estimate, 1992.....	1,249,800,000
House allowance	1,364,859,000
Committee recommendation.....	1,325,421,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,325,421,000 for Army ammunition. This is \$75,621,000 above the budget and \$39,438,000 below the House allowance.

This appropriation finances the acquisition of ammunition for training and war reserve stocks, modernization and maintenance of equipment and facilities (including construction), and maintenance of inactive ammunition facilities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendation in comparison with the budget request:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	House amount	
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY												
AMMUNITION												
SPECIAL AMMUNITION												
NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT MATERIEL.....	--	7,241	--	--	7,241	--	--	7,241	--	--	--	
SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION												
CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES.....	--	64,601	--	--	70,101	--	--	61,901	--	-2,700	-8,200	
CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES.....	--	10,382	--	--	10,682	--	--	10,382	--	--	-300	
CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES.....	--	466	--	--	466	--	--	466	--	--	--	
CTG, .45 CAL, ALL TYPES.....	--	85	--	--	85	--	--	85	--	--	--	
CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES.....	--	4,500	--	--	21,000	--	--	4,500	--	--	-16,500	
CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES.....	--	10,611	--	--	10,611	--	--	10,611	--	--	--	
CTG, 20MM, LED TP, M55.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
CTG, 20MM, PIVADS, M940.....	--	--	--	330	5,000	--	330	5,000	--	+5,000	--	
CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES.....	--	40,652	--	--	39,952	--	--	33,752	--	-6,900	-6,200	
CTG, 25MM, AP TRNG, M910.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
CTG, 25MM, APFSDS-T, M919.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES.....	--	5,258	--	1,000	10,000	--	--	5,258	--	--	-10,000	
CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
M918 TP FOR CEV.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
M922 DUMMY FOR M919.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
M781 PRACTICE.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1,000	--	
M385A1 PRACTICE.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
MORTAR AMMUNITION												
CTG, MORTAR, 60MM, SMOKE, M722.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
CTG, MORTAR, 60MM, 1/10 PRAC, M840.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, HE/MO, XM934.....	--	--	--	108	37,000	--	108	37,000	--	+37,000	--	
CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, HE/PO, XM933.....	132	36,421	132	132	36,421	--	132	36,421	--	--	--	
CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, ILLUM, XM930.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, SMOKE, XM929.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
TANK AMMUNITION												
CTG, TANK, 35MM, SUBCAL PRAC, M968.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
CTG, TANK, 105MM, TP-T, M690A1.....	120	29,323	120	120	21,223	--	120	21,223	--	-8,100	--	
CTG, TANK, 105MM, DS-TP, M724A1.....	120	29,548	120	120	16,948	--	120	16,948	--	-12,600	--	
CTG, TANK, 105MM, APFSDS-T, M900A1.....	45	64,477	45	45	64,477	--	45	64,477	--	--	--	
CTG, TANK, 120MM, TP-T, M831.....	39	31,387	39	39	31,387	--	39	31,387	--	--	--	
CTG, TANK, 120MM, TPCSDS-T, M865.....	176	111,627	176	176	111,627	--	176	111,627	--	--	--	

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget		House		Committee recommendation		Senate compared to--	
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Budget amount	House amount
ARTILLERY AMMUNITION								
CTG, ARTY, 105MM, HERA, M913.....	30	15,059	30	15,059	30	15,059	--	--
PROJ, ARTY, 155MM, ADAM-S M731.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PROJ, ARTY, 155MM, BASEBURNER M86A.....	134	120,914	167	150,914	167	150,914	+30,000	--
PROJ, ARTY, 155MM, SADAM, XM898.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PROJ, ARTY, 155MM, HE, M107.....	--	--	24	4,600	--	--	--	-4,600
PROP CHG, 155MM, RED BAG, M203.....	241	144,583	241	144,583	241	144,583	--	--
PROP CHG, 8-INCH, GREEN BAG, M1.....	102	18,179	102	18,179	102	18,179	--	--
PROP CHG, 155MM, WHITE BAG.....	--	--	250	21,200	--	--	-250	-21,200
ARTILLERY FUZES								
FUZE, ARTILLERY, ELEC TIME, M767.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
FUZE, ARTILLERY, PROXIMITY, M732A2.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
FUZE, ARTILLERY, ELEC TIME, M762.....	--	--	--	22,000	--	22,000	+22,000	--
FUZE, ARTILLERY, MECH-TIME, M577.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
FUZE, ARTILLERY, MOUT, MC399 MOD 1.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MINES								
MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES.....	--	8,201	--	8,201	--	8,201	--	--
MINE, VOLCANO, AT/AP, M87.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ROCKETS								
AT-4 MULTI-PURPOSE WEAPON.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ROCKET, LAW, ALL TYPES.....	--	2,143	--	2,143	--	2,143	--	--
ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES.....	--	39,000	--	39,000	--	39,000	+39,000	--
ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ILLUM, M257.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ROCKET, HYDRA 70, SIG PRAC, M274.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OTHER AMMUNITION								
PRIMER, PERCUSSION, M82.....	2,098	6,574	2,098	6,574	2,098	6,574	--	--
DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES.....	--	6,649	--	6,649	--	6,649	--	--
GRENADES, ALL TYPES.....	--	3,949	--	3,949	--	3,949	--	--
SIGNALS, ALL TYPES.....	--	4,614	--	4,614	--	4,614	--	--
SIMULATIONS, ALL TYPES.....	--	4,735	--	4,735	--	4,735	--	--
MISCELLANEOUS								
AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES.....	--	24,447	--	24,447	--	24,447	--	--
CAD/PAD, ALL TYPES.....	--	9,216	--	9,216	--	9,216	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MILLION.....	--	1,184	--	1,184	--	1,184	--	--
EOD EXPLOSIVE ITEMS.....	--	2,274	--	2,274	--	2,274	--	--
AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT.....	--	6,815	--	6,815	--	6,815	--	--
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO).....	--	6,341	--	6,341	--	6,341	--	+6,341

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AMMUNITION REVIEW

The Committee commends the staff of the General Accounting Office [GAO] for its professionalism and the high quality of its review of the fiscal year 1992 ammunition requirements of the Department of Defense. Many of the GAO's findings are reflected in the Committee's recommendations.

Quantities excess to 1992 requirements.—Based on the General Accounting Office's review of Army ammunition inventories and requirements, the following adjustments are recommended in small- and medium-caliber ammunition, rockets, and other ammunition procurement. These reductions are based on planned procurements that are excess to 1992 requirements, unwarranted increases in procurement leadtimes and procurement delays. It should be noted that these reductions are based on excess inventories for existing force structure, and even less ammunition will be required by fewer Army divisions during the next few years.

CTG, 5.56 mm all types.....	-\$2,700,000
CTG, 25, AP training, M-910.....	-9,200,000
CTG, tank, 105 mm, TP-T, M-490A1.....	-8,100,000
CTG, tank, 105 mm, DS-TP, M-724A1.....	-12,600,000
Nitroguanidine.....	-15,079,000
Classified programs.....	-18,000,000
Maintenance of inactive facilities.....	-2,500,000

Increases to fiscal year 1992 program.—The Committee has increased the funding for several Army ammunition programs above the budget request in recognition of the need to improve readiness, enhance training and increase the sustainability of deployed Army forces.

CTG, 20 mm, PIVAD, M-940.....	+\$5,000,000
CTG, 25, all types.....	+2,300,000
CTG, mortar, 120 mm, HE/MO, XM-934.....	+37,000,000
Proj, arty, 155 mm, baseburner, M-864.....	+30,000,000
Fuze, artillery, elec. time, M-762.....	+22,000,000
Rocket, Hydra 70, all types.....	+39,000,000
Provision of industrial facilities.....	+3,500,000
Conventional ammunition demilitarization.....	+5,000,000

CTG, 5.56 mm all types.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$2,700,000 in the Army's \$16,700,000 request for 99,623,000 5.56 mm blank cartridges because projected inventories will exceed requirements by 16,329,000 cartridges.

CTG, 20 mm, PIVADS, M-940.—The Committee recommends a funding increase of \$5,000,000 over the budget request for the 20 mm PIVADS cartridge to enhance readiness, improve training, maintain the industrial base, and increase war reserves.

CTG, 25 mm, all types.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$2,300,000 in the Army's request for 25 mm cartridges, all types, to enhance readiness. However, the Committee recommends a reduction of \$9,200,000 in the Army's \$15,200,000 request for 1,020,000 25 mm AP training, M-910 cartridges because projected inventories will exceed requirements by 618,000 cartridges. Army officials agreed with this GAO assessment.

CTG, tank, 105 mm, TP-T, M-490A1.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$8,100,000 in the Army's request for 120,000 105 mm M-490A1 tank training cartridges by 33,000 cartridges be-

cause the projected inventory would exceed the Army's requirements at the end of the fiscal year 1992 program period. The Army is reviewing its 105 mm tank training requirements due to force structure changes and expects the requirements to decrease.

CTG, tank, 105 mm, DS-TP, M-724A1.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$12,500,000 in the Army's request for 120,000 105 mm M-724A1 tank training cartridges by 51,000 cartridges because the projected inventory would exceed the Army's requirements at the end of the fiscal year 1992 program period. Even though the Appropriations Committees provided more funds for M-724A1 cartridges than the Army requested for fiscal year 1991, the Army is requesting funds for this cartridge in both fiscal years 1992 and 1993. The Army is reviewing its 105 mm tank training requirements due to force structure changes and expects its requirements to decrease.

CTG, mortar, 120 mm, HE/MO, XM-934.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$37,000,000 over the budget request to enhance readiness, improve training, maintain the industrial base, and increase war reserves.

Proj, arty, 155 mm, baseburner, M-864.—The Committee recommends an increase in funding of \$30,000,000 over the budget request to enhance readiness, improve training, maintain the industrial base, and increase war reserves.

Fuze, artillery, elec. time, M-762.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$22,000,000 over the budget request to enhance readiness, improve training, maintain the industrial base, and increase war reserves.

Rocket, hydra, 70, all types.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$39,000,000 over the budget request to enhance readiness, improve training, maintain the industrial base, and increase war reserves.

Nitroguanidine.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$15,079,000 from the Army's budget request for 5 million pounds of nitroguanidine. The Army's inventory objective for nitroguanidine is 25 million pounds and without a fiscal year 1992 program, the Army will have 24.6 million pounds of nitroguanidine, or 98.4 percent of the inventory objective, by the end of the fiscal year 1992 program period. The Army estimates that about \$1,800,000 would be needed to procure the remaining 0.4 million pounds of nitroguanidine that would be needed to reach the Army's inventory objective. The Army's use of nitroguanidine has decreased since the inventory objective was established. The Committee recommends that \$10,000,000 be made available by the Army in fiscal year 1992 for plant closure costs.

Classified programs.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$18,000,000 from the budget request for classified programs.

Provision of industrial facilities.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$2,000,000 over the budget request to support the Army production base and to continue the maintenance of the HMX pilot plant. Funding is needed to support DOD explosive materials research and development until the DOD develops a plan to maintain this unique facility. The Committee also recommends an increase of \$1,500,000 in the budget request to continue the Army Material Command project 5982753 to establish the preliminary

design, detailed program plan, and detailed cost estimate for the Army of the advanced propellant manufacturing and test production facility.

Maintenance of inactive facilities.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$2,500,000 in the Army's \$70,100,000 request for maintenance of inactive industrial facilities. The reduction represents the half-year cost of maintaining inactive facilities and results from the Army decision not to place the binary chemical facilities at the Pine Bluff Arsenal in layaway status until mid or late fiscal year 1992. Layaway of the multiple-launch rocket system is estimated to be completed by January 1992, the M-687 projectile facilities by April 1992, and the Bigeye facilities by June 1992. Army officials agreed with a GAO analysis of this issue.

Conventional ammunition demilitarization.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$5,000,000 for the budget request for conventional ammunition demilitarization to enhance safety and prevent environmental contamination.

Depleted uranium penetrator procurement.—The Committee supports the Army's policy of split awards to the U.S. mobilization base producers of depleted uranium penetrator components for the Department of Defense. By maintaining more than one source of these critical and unique components, the Army protects the mobilization base and assures competitive bidding. The Committee is aware that other services departments are contemplating procurement of depleted uranium materials from commercial sources and directs that the services adopt a competitive procurement policy resulting in economically viable multiple awards to qualified producers from the U.S. mobilization base.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Appropriations, 1991	\$2,453,057,000
Budget estimate, 1992	3,163,800,000
House allowance	3,021,435,000
Committee recommendation	3,013,798,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,013,798,000, a decrease of \$150,002,000 below the President's budget and \$7,637,000 below the House allowance.

This appropriation finances the acquisition of: tactical and commercial vehicles including trucks, semitrailers, and trailers of all types to provide mobility to field forces and the Army logistical system; communications and electronics equipment of all types to provide fixed, semi-fixed, and mobile strategic and tactical communications equipment; and other support equipment such as chemical defensive equipment, tactical bridging equipment, maintenance shop sets, construction equipment, floating and rail equipment, generators and power units, material handling equipment, medical support equipment, special equipment for user testing, and training devices that are not specific to a particular weapon system. In each of these activities, funds are also included for modification of in-service equipment, spares and repair parts, and production base support.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendations in comparison to the President's amended budget request and the House-passed bill:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget		House		Committee recommendation		Senate compared to--	
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Budget amount	House amount
OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY								
TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES								
TACTICAL VEHICLES								
TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS.....		8,311	--	7,500	--	33,311	+25,000	+25,811
SEMITRAILER FB 88/CONT TRANS 22 1/2 T.....		--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SEMITRAILER, TANK, 5000G.....		--	--	23,900	--	--	--	-23,900
M1 MOB MULTI-PURP WILD VEN (MMPWV)(MYP).....	7,302	282,137	7,302	282,137	7,302	282,137	--	--
FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEN (MYP).....	1,815	161,028	1,815	161,028	1,815	161,028	--	-1,359
HEAVY EQUIPMENT TRANSPORTER SYS.....	281	182,859	--	99,743	281	160,000	-22,859	--
HEAVY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (MYP).....		99,743	281	99,743	281	99,743	--	--
FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (MYP).....		--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916.....		3,133	--	3,133	--	3,133	--	--
MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP.....		100	--	100	--	100	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (TAC VEN).....		--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL, TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES.....								
NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES								
PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES.....	453	7,184	225	3,592	453	3,592	-3,592	+228
GENERAL PURPOSE VEHICLES.....		4,838	--	4,838	--	4,838	--	--
SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES.....		4,878	--	4,878	--	4,878	--	--
TOTAL, NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES.....								
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES								
1ST DEST TRANS/TOT PKG FIELDING TACOM.....		8,878	--	8,878	--	8,878	--	--
SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT PEO.....		3,296	--	3,296	--	3,296	--	--
PROJECT MANAGEMENT SUPPORT.....		897	--	897	--	897	--	--
SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT (TACOM).....		--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....		--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TAC VEN).....		--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL, TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES.....		767,282		765,279		765,831	-1,451	+552
COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT								
COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS								
JCS EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM).....								
COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS								
DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM.....		47,874	--	47,874	--	47,874	--	--
GNF CONTROL.....	3	1,100	3	1,100	--	1,100	--	--
NAVSTAR USER EQUIPMENT.....		--	--	--	--	--	--	--
NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM.....	1,149	32,699	1,149	32,699	1,149	32,699	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
NAVSTAR AIRBORNE.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SINGLE CHANNEL OBJECT TACT TERM (SCOTT).....	--	17,878	--	--	17,878	--	--	17,878	--	--	--	--
MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT).....	--	9,436	--	--	9,436	--	--	9,436	--	--	--	--
COMH - C3 SYSTEM												
COMMAND CENTER IMPROVEMENT PROG (CCIP).....	--	8,680	--	--	8,680	--	--	8,680	--	--	--	--
EUSA-C31 INITIATIVES.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SECURE CONFERRING PROJECT.....	--	629	--	--	629	--	--	629	--	--	--	--
STD THEATER CMD & CONTROL SYS (STACCS).....	--	1,445	--	--	1,445	--	--	1,445	--	--	--	--
WARCCS INFORMATION SYSTEM (WIS).....	--	10,045	--	--	10,045	--	--	10,045	--	--	--	--
COMH - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS												
ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (ADDS).....	--	17,199	--	--	17,199	--	--	17,199	--	--	--	-27,000
MOBILE SUBSCRIBER EQUIP (MSE).....	--	72,538	--	--	72,538	--	--	72,538	--	--	--	--
SINGULARS FAMILY.....	--	287,534	--	--	287,534	--	--	287,534	--	--	--	--
SU ASIA COMM INFRASTRUCTURE.....	--	1,436	--	--	1,436	--	--	1,436	--	--	--	--
EAC COMMUNICATIONS.....	--	27,574	--	--	27,574	--	--	40,774	--	--	--	+13,200
MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (EAC COMM).....	--	16,209	--	--	16,209	--	--	16,209	--	+13,200	--	+4,000
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (CHBT COMM).....	--	8,963	--	--	8,963	--	--	8,963	--	--	--	--
INFORMATION SECURITY												
TSEC - AEPOS (EARM AUTOMATION).....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS).....	--	7,560	--	--	7,560	--	--	7,560	--	--	--	--
TSEC - TEMPEST (COMSEC).....	--	1,000	--	--	1,000	--	--	1,000	--	--	--	--
TSEC - TRUNK ENCRYPTION DEVICES (TED).....	--	7,099	--	--	7,099	--	--	4,244	--	-2,855	--	-2,855
TSEC/KG-86, DED LOOP ENCRYP DEV.....	1,366	11,091	1,366	1,366	11,091	1,366	1,366	11,091	1,366	11,091	1,366	11,091
TSEC/KY-99, HINTERM.....	--	6,619	--	--	6,619	--	--	6,619	--	--	--	--
TSEC - SEC VOICE IMPRVY PROG (COMSEC).....	--	2,290	--	--	2,290	--	--	2,290	--	--	--	--
TSEC - ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (COMSEC).....	--	7,269	--	--	7,269	--	--	7,269	--	--	--	--
COMH - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS												
TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION.....	--	6,210	--	--	6,210	--	--	6,210	--	--	--	--
C-E FACILITIES/PROJECTS.....	--	4,080	--	--	4,080	--	--	4,080	--	--	--	--
DEFENSE DATA NETWORK (DDN).....	--	3,029	--	--	3,029	--	--	3,029	--	--	--	--
ELECTRONAG COMP PROG (ENCP).....	--	619	--	--	619	--	--	619	--	--	--	--
WJ TECH CON IMP PROG (UMTICP).....	--	3,177	--	--	3,177	--	--	3,177	--	--	--	--
COMH - BASE COMMUNICATIONS												
INFORMATION SYSTEMS.....	--	55,372	--	--	55,372	--	--	48,472	--	-6,900	--	-6,900
DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS).....	--	9,241	--	--	9,241	--	--	9,241	--	--	--	--
LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN).....	--	5,230	--	--	5,230	--	--	5,230	--	--	--	--
PENTAGON TELECON CTR (PTC).....	--	2,906	--	--	2,906	--	--	2,906	--	--	--	--

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
DETECTING SET, MINE, AN/PSS-12.....	5,600	8,400	5,600	8,400	5,600	8,400	5,600	8,400	--	--	--	--
VEHICLE MAGNETIC SIGNATURE DUP.....	247	11,431	247	11,431	247	11,431	247	11,431	--	--	--	--
INT SURVEY EQ (AISI).....	--	4,400	--	4,400	--	4,400	--	4,400	--	--	--	--
MOD IN-SVC EQ (ENGR-NC).....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT												
AIR CONDITIONERS VARIOUS SIZE/CAPACITY.....	--	8,356	--	8,356	--	8,356	--	8,356	--	--	--	--
FIELD KITCHEN, MOBILE, TRL MTD.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
STANDARD INTEGRATED CMD POST SYSTEM.....	--	41,503	--	41,503	--	41,503	--	41,503	--	--	--	--
LAUNDRY UNIT/TRL MTD.....	85	6,000	85	6,000	85	6,000	85	6,000	--	+3,000	--	+3,000
TOOL OUTFIT, PIONEER.....	292	5,909	292	5,909	292	5,909	292	5,909	--	--	--	--
SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT.....	--	12,278	--	11,578	--	11,578	--	11,578	--	--	--	+700
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.00 (CSS-EG).....	--	11,500	--	10,000	--	10,000	--	11,500	--	--	--	+1,500
PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT												
TANK ASSEMBLY FAB COLL POL 50000 G.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TANK ASSEMBLY FAB COLLAPSIBLE POL 10000G.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TANK ASSY, FAB COLLAPS, 20,000 GAL POL.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TANK/PUMP UNIT LIQ DISP F/TRK MOUNTING.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
LABORATORY, PETROLEUM, SEMI-TRLR MTD.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
FUEL SYSTEM SUPPLY POINT, 60000 GALLON.....	158	5,000	158	5,000	158	5,000	158	5,000	--	--	--	--
PUMP ASSY LIQ GAS WHL 4 IN OUT 350 GPM.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SUA PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM.....	--	7,944	--	7,944	--	7,944	--	7,944	--	--	--	--
FORWARD AREA REFUELING SYS ADV AVIATION.....	5	1,000	5	1,000	5	1,000	5	1,000	--	--	--	--
HERIT AVIATION REFUELING SYSTEM.....	320	6,400	320	6,400	320	6,400	320	6,400	--	--	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.00 (POL).....	--	7,939	--	7,939	--	7,939	--	7,939	--	--	--	--
WATER EQUIPMENT												
WATER PURIF UNIT REV OS 3000 GPM.....	42	16,698	--	--	42	16,698	--	16,698	--	--	+42	+16,698
FWD AREA WTR POINT SUP SYSTEM.....	157	2,609	157	2,609	157	2,609	157	2,609	--	--	--	--
TANK FABRIC COLL WTR 3000 GAL (ONTON).....	1,070	2,132	1,070	2,132	1,070	2,132	1,070	2,132	--	--	--	--
WATER QUALITY ANALYSIS SET PURIF.....	432	3,445	432	3,445	432	3,445	432	3,445	--	--	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.00 (WATER EQ).....	--	8,191	--	8,191	--	8,191	--	8,191	--	--	--	--
MEDICAL EQUIPMENT												
COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL.....	--	19,204	--	19,204	--	19,204	--	19,204	--	--	--	--
MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	84,893	--	84,893	--	84,893	--	84,893	--	--	--	-5,000
MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT												
TOOL OUTFIT HYDRAULIC REPAIR 3/4 TRL MTD.....	28	1,700	28	1,700	28	1,700	28	1,700	--	--	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.00 (MAINT EQ).....	--	9,247	--	9,247	--	9,247	--	9,247	--	--	--	--
SMALL REPLACEMENT EXCAVATOR (SEE).....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Budget amount	House amount
DBOF ADJUSTMENT.....	--	--		--	157,300		--	--		--	--	-157,300
TOTAL PACKAGE FIELDING.....	--	--		--	-90,700		--	--		--	--	+90,700
DBOF DENY MILCON CAPITAL BUDGET.....	--	--		--	--		--	-1,100		--	-1,100	-1,100
DBOF TECHNICAL CORRECTION.....	--	--		--	--		--	62,000		--	+62,000	+62,000
ARMY SHELTER FAMILY.....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
CLASSIFIED PROGRAM.....	--	--		--	-5,000		--	--		--	--	+5,000
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY.....		3,163,800			3,021,435			3,013,798			-150,002	-7,637

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES

Tactical trailers/dolly sets.—The Army has requested \$8,311,000 for miscellaneous tactical trailers and dolly sets which are used for such missions as transporting generators, shelters, water, ammunition, and general cargo. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$33,311,000, an increase of \$25,000,000 over the budget request and \$25,811,000 more than the House allowance.

The Committee provides the additional funding to procure additional M-149A2 400-gallon, insulated, stainless steel water trailers in fiscal year 1992, which are urgently needed to replace outdated, unserviceable fiberglass water trailers. The Committee expects the Army to exercise available negotiated contract options to procure as many M-149A2 water trailers as these additional funds will allow.

The Committee continues to support the centralization of all Department of Defense trailer procurements within the Army and is pleased with the progress being made in this area. As the recent experience in Southwest Asia has shown, success in combat often hinges on essential pieces of support equipment like trailers and cargo vehicles. Unfortunately, procurement of such equipment is frequently overlooked in favor of major weapons systems.

The Committee understands that the Army has procured both the M-116A3 3/4-ton chassis and the M-101A2 3/4-ton cargo trailer using the small disadvantaged business and small business set-aside programs respectively. The Committee applauds the Army's efforts to provide small and disadvantaged firms access to defense contracts, which, in turn, helps to expand the industrial base. The Committee fully expects and directs that this contracting arrangement will continue in the future and designates this trailer program a matter of congressional interest. The Committee directs that the M-116A3 trailer contract remain within the small disadvantaged business set-aside program and the M-101A2 trailer contract remain within the small business set-aside program. Any deviation from this split between the two categories will not be acceptable to the Committee and the Army is directed to inform this Committee well in advance of any proposed change in the future.

The Committee has been informed that the Army is considering a follow-on cargo trailer procurement for the M-101 and M-116. The Committee has also been informed that modified versions of the current trailers, the M-101A3 and M-116A3, may meet the requirements of the follow-on trailer. Samples of the modified trailer were deployed and tested in Operations Desert Shield/Storm and it is the understanding of the Committee, received excellent performance reports.

The Committee urges the Army to give serious consideration to the M-101A3 and the M-116A3 trailers for use in the Army's new high mobility trailer program. The Committee also recommends that the Army's product manager for trailers manage the M-103A3 and M-116A3 trailer program.

COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT

Echelons above corps [EAC] communications.—The Army has not requested funds for the downsizing of digital group multiplexer [DGM] assemblages in fiscal year 1992, but did realign funds in fiscal year 1991 to support this effort. This program significantly reduces the space needed to contain DGM equipment which allows the Army to save time and money when having to transport these systems great distances. Operations Desert Shield/Storm validated the need to improve the Army's ability to deploy over long distances on short notice. The Committee supports the Army's efforts to downsize DGM assemblages and feels that the Army should continue this program until its force structure requirements are satisfied. The additional \$13,200,000 provided by the Committee will allow the Army to continue a cost-effective retrofit downsizing program for communication equipment shelters.

TSEC-trunk encryption devices.—The Army budget request includes \$7,099,000 to purchase ruggedized and nonruggedized rack-mounted cryptographic security equipment. The Army has overstated its unit prices in the budget by nearly one-third. By using the correct unit costs and assuming that additional units of this critical device will be purchased in fiscal year 1991 with that year's assets, fiscal year 1992 units and funding may be reduced with no impact to the program. Therefore, the Committee recommends a reduction of \$2,855,000.

Information systems.—The Army budget request includes \$55,372,000 for the improvement or modernization of information systems encompassing nontactical telecommunications systems worldwide. As part of this request, the Army has identified \$3,900,000 for the upgrade of digital switches at Fort Chaffee located in Fort Smith, AR. Fort Chaffee has been recommended for base closure. While some Reserve/Guard functions will be maintained at this base and some realignments occur, the changing mission focus of this base necessitates the deferral of this effort until the Army has restudied its telephone digital switching upgrade requirements in light of the base closure actions. Therefore, the Committee recommends the deletion of funding for the Fort Chaffee digital switch upgrade.

Commander's tactical terminal.—The Army budget request includes \$11,212,000 for the purchase of secure communications reporting devices that will allow tactical commanders access to additional intelligence gathering and processing facilities via satellite networks. In procuring these systems, the Army is not adhering to the congressionally directed full-funding policy that requires the budgeting of installation funding concurrent with the equipment acquisition funds regardless of the date of installation. The Army has not budgeted funds to install either its fiscal year 1991 or 1992 equipment buys. Since the Army has not adequately funded a balanced program, the Committee recommends a reduction of \$7,863,000.

Night vision devices.—The Army budget request includes \$102,944,000 for the purchase of night vision devices including goggles, weapon sights, aiming lights, range finders, and other related equipment. Unit costs for night vision devices (AN/PVS-7) pro-

cured in fiscal year 1991 do not support the unit costs reflected in the fiscal year 1992 request. Using fiscal year 1991 unit costs, plus an allowance for inflation, will allow the Army to procure the same number of night vision devices at a much lower cost than portrayed in the budget. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$8,594,000 to this program.

Physical security systems.—The Army budget request includes \$20,182,000 to procure various intrusion detection systems to ensure the security of Army installations and assets. This funding also includes resources for major commands to locally procure commercial intrusion detection systems [CIDS] to meet specific security needs. The fiscal year 1991 program profile of sites receiving CIDS has only recently been finalized and the fiscal year 1992 effort is still under consideration at this time. In order that the Army may provide budget documentation with supportable, firm requirements, the Committee recommends the deferral of fiscal year 1992 funding in the amount of \$8,393,000 in order to provide a better alignment between requirements definition and funding.

Maneuver control system [MCS].—The Army budget request includes \$45,942,000 to purchase hardware for the MCS which is an automated tactical command and control system comprised of a network of computer terminals to process combat information for battle staffs. The Army had originally intended to procure this equipment during fiscal year 1992, but delays in the operational test and evaluation will result in this procurement occurring in fiscal year 1993 at the earliest. Given the delay in this program, the Committee recommends a reduction of \$45,942,000.

Army printing and binding equipment.—The Army budget request includes \$4,357,000 for the purchase of composing, platemaking, printing, binding, and related equipment required to produce publications and illustrations. As a result of the defense management review, printing and publication services are being consolidated under the Navy. While the actual number of sites to be transferred is still undetermined, the Department has placed a moratorium on the replacement of printing and binding equipment. Since fiscal year 1991 funds have not been used by the Army, and the decision on which facilities will be realigned to the Navy has not yet been made, the fiscal year 1992 program may be slipped pending further requirements clarification for this program. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$4,357,000.

Poor obligation rates/program execution performance.—The following program reductions are recommended in light of poor program execution performance during fiscal year 1991:

Modification of in-service equipment.....	—\$4,600,000
PECIP and QRIP.....	—1,400,000
Total.....	—6,000,000

OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT

Chemical agent monitor.—The Army has requested \$6,376,000 for the procurement of 50 chemical agent monitors in fiscal year 1992. The Committee recommends \$10,176,000, an increase of \$3,800,000 over the amounts requested and the House allowance.

The recommended increase is a result of realignment of funds for the Department's arms control requirements for fiscal year 1992 as discussed within the operation and maintenance section of this report.

Chemical/biological defense equipment.—The Committee is concerned that the chemical and biological protection equipment available to U.S. forces may be inadequate to meet existing threats and inferior to currently available technology. The Committee is particularly concerned about reports that U.S. forces were equipped with NBC protective gear which did not afford optimum protection, that some of this equipment was obsolete by comparison to that used by our allies, and most alarmingly, by our adversaries.

Furthermore, the Committee is concerned that the use of existing NBC protective gear in desert environments severely degrades the movement and sensory awareness, and hence the conventional survivability, of our troops. Existing NBC protective suits are often too cumbersome and heavy to allow for sustained combat operations without fatigue and lack the flexibility necessary for easy decontamination.

The Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to report to the Committee, no later than August 1, 1992, on the status of current procurement programs for NBC defensive gear, new technologies under development, existing inventories, comparative testing of U.S. and foreign equipment on effectiveness and ease of use, and results of Desert Storm experience in preparing for possible NBC attack. Testimony should be taken from the soldiers, sailors, and airmen who must wear this equipment to protect themselves from lethal liquid and gas agents.

Additionally, the Committee notes that each year syringes containing nerve-gas antidote are being discarded because the ampoule reaches the end of its prescribed shelf-life of approximately 5 years. The Committee expects the Army to investigate, for possible procurement, new money-saving technologies which require only the replacement of the ampoule.

OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends incorporating the following adjustments to the budget estimate, in accordance with the Senate authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Heavy equipment transporters.....	182,859	161,359	160,000	−22,859	−1,359
Passenger-carrying vehicles.....	7,184	3,592	3,592	−3,592	
Laundry unit/trl mtd.....	6,000	6,000	9,000	+3,000	+3,000
Generators and associated equip.....	73,804	45,804	45,804	−28,000	
DBOF deny MilCon capital budget.....			−1,100	−1,100	−1,100
DBOF technical correction.....			62,000	+62,000	+62,000

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Appropriations, 1991	\$7,810,452,000
Budget estimate, 1992	¹ 7,114,800,000
House Allowance.....	7,683,633,000
Committee recommendation.....	7,025,920,000

¹ The budget estimate does not include a transfer of \$851,600,000 to fiscal year 1991 aircraft procurement, Navy from fiscal year 1991 RDT&E, Navy.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,025,920,000, \$88,880,000 below the amended budget request and \$657,713,000 below the House allowance.

This appropriation finances the construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, including ordnance systems, ground support equipment, flight simulators, spare parts, accessories, and specialized equipment; and expansion of public and private plants.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The Committee has reviewed the Navy's aircraft procurement request carefully. The program proposed by the Defense Department represents a significant departure from previous plans. The Navy is no longer requesting funding for F-14 production nor for remanufacturing, nor the stealthy A-12 program, the P-7 program, nor the AV-8B. In addition, the budget assumes the Navy will not procure a variant of the advanced tactical fighter. In the original President's budget there was no clear direction for Navy aviation. In its amended budget submission, the Navy has begun to address this problem, but several questions remain.

The Navy's amended request centers on increasing the F/A-18 program in the near term, modifying that aircraft in the near future, and producing a new attack aircraft, the A-X, to replace the A-6 and the canceled A-12 in the distant future. The Navy is committed to canceling the F-14 aircraft without a replacement. Furthermore, there are no near-term plans to replace the AV-8B, the P-7, the S-3, or the V-22.

While it is clear that funding limits the Navy's ability to provide for each of these shortfalls in this budget, the excuse must be questioned when the Navy is requesting nearly \$24,000,000,000 to operate its forces, requesting the purchase of one \$2,000,000,000 submarine, five destroyers costing \$4,300,000,000 annually, and is planning to purchase another aircraft carrier beginning in fiscal year 1993. Instead, the Navy must be held responsible for setting these priorities. The Congress can only conclude that priority for aviation investment falls far behind that for shipbuilding and operations and maintenance.

In reviewing the budget request, the Committee has supported the thrust of the Navy's amended budget submission with certain exceptions. The Committee has attempted to infuse the Marine Corps medium-lift program with a stopgap program, has cut back on unnecessary increases, and recommended termination of lower priority or untested programs. The Committee has been unable to provide sufficient resources within the authorized ceiling to address all of the shortfalls addressed above. Solving these problems will, and should, remain the challenge for the Navy.

The specific adjustments recommended by the Committee are listed in the table below and described in the text which follows.

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Budget amount	House amount
OTHER AIRCRAFT												
BA-4 OTHER AIRCRAFT												
HH-60H (HELICOPTER)	9	165,559		9	165,559		--	--		-9	-165,559	-165,559
HH-60H (HELICOPTER) (AP-CY)	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
KC-130T	--	--		--	--		2	67,000		+2	+67,000	+67,000
C-130T	--	--		--	--		4	114,000		+4	+114,000	+114,000
TOTAL, OTHER AIRCRAFT								181,000			+15,441	+15,441
MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT												
BA-5 MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT												
A-3 SERIES	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
A-4 SERIES	--	4,353		--	4,353		--	4,353		--	--	--
A-6 SERIES	--	5,485		--	5,485		--	5,485		--	--	--
EA-6 SERIES	--	71,654		--	71,654		--	71,654		--	--	-29,999
A-7 SERIES	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
AV-8 SERIES	--	19,791		--	19,791		--	19,791		--	--	--
AV-8B REMANUFACTURE	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
F-4 SERIES	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
RF-4 SERIES	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
F-14 SERIES	--	53,562		--	53,562		--	53,562		--	--	--
ADVERSARY	--	3,874		--	3,874		--	3,874		--	--	--
ES-3 SERIES	--	5,562		--	5,562		--	5,562		--	--	--
OV-10 SERIES	--	4,176		--	4,176		--	4,176		--	--	-19,000
F-18 SERIES	--	28,431		--	28,431		--	28,431		--	--	--
H-46 SERIES	--	68,064		--	68,064		--	68,064		--	--	--
H-53 SERIES	--	50,216		--	50,216		--	50,216		--	--	--
SH-60 SERIES	--	29,007		--	29,007		--	29,007		--	--	--
VH-60 SERIES	--	45		--	45		--	45		--	--	--
H-1 SERIES	--	118,201		--	118,201		--	133,201		--	+15,000	+15,000
H-2 SERIES	--	108,202		--	108,202		--	108,202		--	--	-8,000
H-3 SERIES	--	39,513		--	39,513		--	39,513		--	--	--
EP-3 SERIES	--	16,486		--	16,486		--	33,486		--	+15,000	+15,000
P-3 SERIES	--	14,868		--	14,868		--	14,868		--	--	--
S-3 SERIES	--	77,071		--	77,071		--	77,071		--	--	--
E-2 SERIES	--	57,398		--	57,398		--	57,398		--	--	--
TRAINER A/C SERIES	--	10,645		--	10,645		--	10,645		--	--	--
C-130 SERIES	--	16,834		--	16,834		--	16,834		--	--	--

AV-8B.—The Committee recommends \$40,000,000 for the AV-8B program solely for the costs associated with line shutdown. Last year the Congress provided \$40,000,000 in advance procurement to continue production or initiate remanufacturing if either program was requested in the fiscal year 1992 budget request. The Marines decided that continuation of the program was of lower priority than other aviation issues and requested no funding to continue production or initiate a remanufacturing program in fiscal year 1992. Therefore, the Committee supports the recommendation to terminate the program.

The Committee understands that, in carrying out its fiscal year 1991 program, the Marines Corps has committed to a program which is in excess of the funds provided by the Congress. While the Committee objects strongly to the actions of the Marine Corps, it recognizes that a shortfall exists to close out production. In conjunction with the funding provided in fiscal year 1991, the Committee believes that the AV-8B program can be terminated with the funds recommended herein.

F/A-18.—In the President's budget for fiscal year 1992, the Defense Department requested funds for 36 F/A-18 aircraft. Subsequently, the President requested a budget amendment which, if adopted, would increase production to 48 aircraft. The rationale for the amendment was to increase production following the cancellation of the A-12 program. The Committee questions the need for increasing the F/A-18 program noting that the fleet size is decreasing. Further, the Desert Storm supplemental requests funds for an additional F/A-18 aircraft to replace fighter and attack aircraft lost due to the hostilities in the Persian Gulf.

The Committee recommends \$1,784,666,000 for the purchase of 39 F/A-18 aircraft. In conjunction with funds to be provided in the Desert Storm supplemental this will allow the Navy to purchase 48 F/A-18 aircraft. The Committee believes this level is sufficient to meet the Navy's requirements this year. The allowance includes \$41,000,000 for the purchase of support and training equipment including a flight simulator for the new Navy Reserve F/A-18 squadron to be located at the Naval Air Station in New Orleans.

CH-53E.—The Committee recommends no funds for the CH-53E program, a reduction of \$508,828,000 from the budget request, and \$591,932,000 below the House allowance. The Committee reiterates its concern for purchasing additional CH-53E aircraft which have been requested as an alternative to the V-22 program. The Committee is convinced that CH-53E production should not go forward until the Congress and administration have reached agreement on the V-22 program. In addition, the Committee again directs the Defense Department to review its plans for the CH-53E program and instructs the Department of Defense to consider the V-22 and other candidates, such as the CH-46E, as alternatives to the CH-53 and CH-60 programs planned by DOD. The Committee will consider a reprogramming of funds for advance procurement for future CH-53 purchases if the Defense Department and Congress agree that CH-53 will be the alternative to the V-22 program.

V-22.—The Committee recommends a transfer of prior-year funds to research and development for the V-22 program as re-

quested in the President's budget request. The House also provided for this transfer.

The Committee understands that the Navy is examining an alternative method of wiring the V-22, known as the ribbonized organized integrated interconnecting system [ROI]. This improved system could potentially provide a major improvement in the reliability and maintainability for the V-22 electrical systems while reducing weight. As such, the Committee directs the Navy to report on the potential and cost effectiveness of using ROI or other wiring techniques on the V-22. This report should include the total cost to integrate ROI into the V-22 and discuss the maintenance, reliability, and weight benefits from the new system. The Committee expects the report to be made available by April 15, 1991.

CH-46E.—The Committee understands that the Marine Corps suggested in fiscal year 1992 budget deliberations that production of the CH-46E program be restarted beginning in fiscal year 1993 as a gap filler for the Marines' medium-lift mission. The aging CH-46E helicopter fleet is reaching retirement age. The Marines had planned to procure V-22 aircraft to replace the CH-46E, but V-22 has been delayed due to continuing disagreements between Congress and the administration on the virtues of the program. It is possible that the Marines may yet have the opportunity to purchase V-22 aircraft for this purpose. However, the delays have caused a significant shortfall to occur in the Marines' medium-lift capability. Further, even if the V-22 ultimately continues, the first aircraft will not reach the fleet for many years. In the meantime no progress will have been made in redressing the medium-lift shortfall.

To address this pressing problem, the Committee recommends \$465,000,000 for CH-46E production. According to Marine estimates, this level is sufficient to restart the line and provide funds for the first 12 aircraft. Another \$60,000,000 is provided for advance procurement for 27 aircraft in fiscal year 1993. Funding could be provided in future years if the V-22 program suffers further delays. The Committee recognizes that there remains strong support in the Congress for the V-22 program, and notes that this gap filler program is not inconsistent with a future V-22 program. Furthermore, the Committee believes that meeting the current medium-lift shortfall is critical.

T-45 trainer.—The Committee recommends \$322,467,000 for the T-45 program, as requested. This is \$40,000,000 below the House allowance. The House recommends funding to upgrade the T-45 with a digital cockpit. The Committee understands that this program can wait an additional year without seriously impacting the Navy's efficient introduction of the upgrade. Therefore, the Committee rejects this additional funding and notes that the Navy should budget for this capability beginning in fiscal year 1993 if it intends to have it incorporated in the program.

The Committee understands that the Defense Department is examining the feasibility of competing future purchases of the T-45 engine. In general, the Committee has been supportive of competing aircraft components, including engines. For this reason, the Committee would support a competition as soon as practical if it is determined that a competition is likely to be cost-effective. While

no funds have been requested or are recommended for this effort, the Committee would support the reallocation of funds within the amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1992, after notification of the Committee, if it appears that an expeditious decision to initiate an engine competition would be advantageous to the Government. This approval is contingent upon the Defense Department requesting funding in its fiscal year 1993 budget to carry out the necessary engine integration and qualification activity.

HH-60 helicopters.—The budget requests \$165,559,000 to restart the HH-60 program which Congress has funded previously for Navy Reserve missions. The Committee recommends no funds for this program. The Committee understands that the Navy wants these helicopters to provide an organic capability aboard aircraft carriers for special mission support and combat search and rescue. The Committee understands that a secondary mission of the CV-helo (SH-60F) program, for which funding is recommended, has been combat search and rescue. It, therefore, does not believe that the HH-60 program is necessary for that purpose. In addition, the budget request documentation noted significant testing problems with the HH-60 pointing out that the helicopter demonstrated very limited potential for completing its missions. While the Navy is confident that further testing will demonstrate improved performance by the helicopter, the testing has been delayed due to Desert Storm. The Committee believes it is inappropriate to initiate procurement of this program until the follow-on test and evaluation has been successfully completed and the Navy has provided sufficient justification for this new capability.

KC-130T.—The Committee recommends \$67,000,000 for purchase of two KC-130T tanker aircraft for the Marine Corps Reserve.

C-130T.—The Committee recommends \$114,000,000 for the purchase of four C-130T aircraft for the Navy Reserve. The Committee understands that two of these aircraft will be stationed at Martinsburg, WV, and two at New Orleans, LA.

A-6 pylons.—The Committee concurs in the amended budget request regarding the rewinging of A-6 aircraft. Included in this program is \$4,815,000 for A-6 pylon modifications in fiscal year 1991. The Committee supports this amount.

Aircraft support equipment.—The Committee recommends \$418,752,000 for purchase of support equipment, a reduction of \$21,493,000 from the budget request and the House allowance. The Committee recommendation denies \$11,043,000 for the AN/USM-406C test equipment which has been canceled. Another \$1,450,000 is denied due to delays in the instrument repair test set. The Marine Rapid Support Program is reduced by \$9,000,000 for unjustified cost increases.

Other authorized adjustments.—The Committee recommends certain adjustments as assumed in the Senate-passed authorization bill. These include increases of \$38,300,000 in E-6 modifications and \$15,000,000 in EP-3 modifications, and a decrease of \$5,300,000 for DBOF adjustments.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Appropriations, 1991	\$5,825,171,000
Budget estimate, 1992	4,581,300,000
House allowance	4,726,795,000
Committee recommendation	4,611,848,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,611,848,000, an increase of \$30,548,000 above the President's request and \$114,947,000 below the House allowance.

This appropriation finances the construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of strategic and tactical missiles, torpedoes, other weapons, and related support equipment, including spare parts and accessories, and the expansion of public and private plants.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendation in comparison to the President's amended budget request and the House-passed bill:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY												
BALLISTIC MISSILES												
TRIDENT I.....	--	6,805	--	--	6,805	--	--	6,805	--	--	--	--
TRIDENT II.....	28	977,353	28	28	977,353	28	28	1,199,753	--	+222,400	--	+222,400
TRIDENT II (AP-CY).....	--	218,000	--	--	218,000	--	--	218,000	--	--	--	--
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES												
MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES.....	--	2,008	--	--	2,008	--	--	2,008	--	--	--	--
TOTAL, BALLISTIC MISSILES.....	--	1,204,166	--	--	1,204,166	--	--	1,426,566	--	+222,400	--	+222,400
OTHER MISSILES												
STRATEGIC MISSILES												
TOMAHAWK.....	236	454,123	236	236	454,123	236	236	454,123	--	--	--	--
TACTICAL MISSILES												
AMRAAM.....	191	205,681	191	191	205,681	191	191	205,681	--	--	--	--
SLAM.....	--	37,803	200	200	212,803	--	--	37,803	--	-200	--	-175,000
HARM.....	749	210,691	749	749	210,691	--	--	210,691	--	-749	--	-210,691
STANDARD MISSILES.....	525	415,254	525	525	415,254	525	525	415,254	--	--	--	--
HELLFIRE.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PENGUIN.....	42	44,445	42	42	44,445	42	42	44,445	--	--	--	--
NAVERICK MISSILES.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOM IIA.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
AERIAL TARGETS.....	--	172,828	--	--	172,828	--	--	172,828	--	--	--	--
DRONES AND DECOYS.....	--	10,000	--	--	10,000	--	--	10,000	--	+10,000	--	--
OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT.....	--	28,096	--	--	28,096	--	--	28,096	--	--	--	--
MODIFICATION OF MISSILES												
TOMAHAWK MODS.....	--	44,842	--	--	44,842	--	--	44,842	--	--	--	--
SPARROW MODS.....	--	53,258	--	--	30,258	--	--	30,258	--	-23,000	--	--
SIDEWINDER MODS.....	--	48,313	--	--	48,313	--	--	48,313	--	--	--	--
PHOENIX MODS.....	--	12,166	--	--	12,166	--	--	12,166	--	--	--	--
HARPOON MODS.....	--	37,401	--	--	37,401	--	--	37,401	--	--	--	--
STANDARD MISSILES MODS.....	--	26,445	--	--	26,445	--	--	26,445	--	--	--	--
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES												
WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES.....	--	31,575	--	--	31,575	--	--	44,775	--	+13,200	--	+13,200
FLEET SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (NTP).....	3	283,079	3	3	283,079	3	3	283,079	--	--	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Budget amount	qty.	House amount
ARCTIC SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS.....	--	3,728		--	--		--	3,728		--	--	+3,728
ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	112,614		--	92,879		--	112,614		--	--	+19,735
TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES.....		2,222,342			2,360,879			2,011,851		-210,491		-349,028
=====												
TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT												
NK-48 ADCAP TORPEDO (MYP).....	108	220,833		108	220,833		108	220,833		--	--	--
NK-48 ADCAP TORPEDO (MYP) (AP-CY).....	--	74,490		--	74,490		--	74,490		--	--	--
NK-50 ALMT.....	246	261,663		246	261,663		246	261,663		--	--	--
ASU TARGETS.....	--	18,371		--	18,371		--	18,371		--	--	--
ASROC.....	--	2,877		--	2,877		--	2,877		--	--	--
VERTICAL LAUNCHED ASROC (VLA).....	--	3,256		--	3,256		--	3,256		--	--	--
MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP												
NK-46 TORPEDO MODS.....	--	9,873		--	9,873		--	9,873		--	--	--
QUICKSTRICE MINE.....	--	11,366		--	11,366		--	11,366		--	--	--
NK-60 CAPTOR MODS.....	--	1,326		--	1,326		--	1,326		--	--	--
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT												
TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	48,453		--	48,453		--	48,453		--	--	--
ASU RANGE SUPPORT.....	--	27,989		--	27,989		--	27,989		--	--	--
LOGISTIC SUPPORT												
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION.....	--	8,959		--	8,959		--	8,959		--	--	--
TOTAL, TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT.....		689,456			689,456			689,456		--	--	--
=====												
OTHER WEAPONS												
GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS												
NK-15 PHALANX CINS.....	--	506		--	506		--	506		--	--	--
NK-19 40MM MACHINE GUN.....	568	11,095		568	11,095		568	11,095		--	--	--
NK-38 25MM GUN MOUNT.....	55	10,009		55	10,009		55	10,009		--	--	--
SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS.....	--	24,058		--	24,058		--	24,058		--	--	--
MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS												
CINS MODS.....	--	56,969		--	56,969		--	56,969		--	--	--
3/34 GUN MOUNT MODS.....	--	17,351		--	17,351		--	17,351		--	--	--
3/50 GUN MOUNT MODS.....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
NK-75 76MM GUN MOUNT MODS.....	--	7,653		--	7,653		--	7,653		--	--	--
MODS UNDER \$2 MILLION.....	--	2,482		--	2,482		--	2,482		--	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
GUN SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	130,123	--	130,123	--	130,123	--	130,123	--	--	--	--
TOTAL, OTHER WEAPONS.....	--	130,123	--	130,123	--	130,123	--	130,123	--	--	--	--
OTHER ORDNANCE	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
AIR LAUNCHED ORDNANCE	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS.....	--	42,162	--	42,162	--	42,162	--	42,162	--	--	--	--
2.75 INCH ROCKETS.....	--	10,699	--	10,699	--	10,699	--	10,699	--	--	--	--
MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION.....	--	8,196	--	31,696	--	31,696	--	31,696	--	+23,500	--	--
PRACTICE BOMBS.....	--	15,888	--	10,336	--	13,100	--	13,100	--	-2,788	--	--
GATOR.....	--	9,567	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-9,567	--	+2,764
SHIP ORDNANCE	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3 INCH/50 GUN AMMUNITION.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5 INCH/38 GUN AMMUNITION.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
CIVIL AMMUNITION.....	--	49,407	--	34,407	--	49,407	--	49,407	--	--	--	--
76MM GUN AMMUNITION.....	--	12,023	--	33,000	--	22,023	--	22,023	--	+10,000	--	+15,000
OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION.....	--	8,941	--	8,941	--	8,941	--	8,941	--	--	--	-10,977
SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMUNITION.....	--	34,906	--	34,906	--	32,400	--	32,400	--	-2,506	--	-2,506
PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION.....	--	13,492	--	13,492	--	13,492	--	13,492	--	--	--	--
	--	14,653	--	14,653	--	14,653	--	14,653	--	--	--	--
TOTAL, OTHER ORDNANCE.....	--	219,934	--	234,292	--	238,573	--	238,573	--	+18,639	--	+4,281
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
CLASSIFIED PROGRAM.....	--	115,279	--	115,279	--	115,279	--	115,279	--	--	--	--
	--	--	--	-7,400	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	+7,400
TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY.....	--	4,581,300	--	4,726,795	--	4,611,848	--	4,611,848	--	+30,548	--	-114,947

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

BALLISTIC MISSILES

Trident II missile.—The Navy's amended fiscal year 1992 budget request includes \$977,353,000 in procurement and \$218,000,000 in advance procurement for 28 Trident II missiles. The Committee recommends \$1,199,753,000 to support the Senate authorization bill's direction to procure 49 Trident missiles in fiscal year 1992. This recommendation is \$222,400,000 above the budget request and the House allowance and recommends full funding for advance procurement.

The Committee also recommends a reduction of \$7,300,000 in fiscal year 1992 and a rescission of \$38,400,000 of excess fiscal year 1991 funds for changes in the budget estimates for START arms control initiatives dealing with the Trident II missile. These revised estimates were provided to the Committee by the Department of Defense and are fully explained within the operation and maintenance section of this report.

TACTICAL MISSILES

HARM missile.—The Navy's amended budget request provides \$210,691,000 for the procurement of 749 block IV high-speed antiradiation missiles [HARM] in fiscal year 1992. The Committee recommends providing no funding for HARM missiles in fiscal year 1992, a reduction of \$210,691,000 from the budget request and the House allowance.

Last year, Congress provided the Navy \$339,200,000 for 1,320 HARM missiles within the fiscal year 1991 Defense appropriations bill. Later in the year, Congress provided the Navy an additional \$193,800,000 for 941 missiles within the Desert Shield/Desert Storm supplemental. Congress also provided the Air Force \$30,300,000 for 120 missiles within the fiscal year 1991 bill and an additional \$226,600,000 for 1,100 HARM missiles within the supplemental appropriations. When added to the amounts projected for foreign military sales, Congress has provided sufficient funding for a total of 3,529 HARM missiles for the fiscal year 1991 funded delivery period, more than twice the amounts to be produced in fiscal year 1990.

To accommodate this large increase in fiscal year 1991 funding, the Navy and the Air Force have decided to compress the fiscal year 1990 funded delivery period by 3 months and to stretch out the fiscal year 1991 funded delivery period by 5 months. This will also necessitate increasing the monthly production rate for both years by approximately 50 percent over the plan presented to Congress last year.

The Committee sees no operational or industrial requirement to produce HARM missile at an accelerated pace. The Committee also notes that the lower cost and more capable block IV seeker and the low-cost seeker [LCS] configurations will not be ready for competition until after fiscal year 1992. Thus, the Committee believes that additional cost savings could be achieved in later years as a result of competition rather than accelerating the more expensive production within the current sole-source environment.

The Committee also has serious questions as to the logic of the proposed monthly production rates for the accelerated HARM production schedule. While Navy and Air Force justification materials state that the maximum production rate of the current producer is 225 missiles per month, the Committee has been informed that the accelerated production schedule calls for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 monthly production rates of 250 missiles per month. It is the desire of the Committee that the HARM missile should be produced at the current one-shift, 8 hours per day, 5 days per week (1-8-5) rate of 125 missiles per month as was requested of Congress when the funds were appropriated. At this production rate, no funds will be required in fiscal year 1992 for production of HARM missiles for the Navy or the Air Force.

Drones and decoys.—The Committee recommends providing \$10,000,000 for the continued modification and procurement of the improved tactical air launched decoy [I-TALD], a system that was successfully deployed in Operations Desert Shield/Storm.

MODIFICATION OF MISSILES

Sparrow missile modification.—The Navy's fiscal year 1992 amended budget request includes \$53,258,000 to modify Sparrow missiles. Of this amount, \$23,000,000 has been requested to support the procurement of 103 Missile Homing Improvement Program [MHIP] modification kits for retrofit into the AIM/RIM-7M missile, upgrading the missile to the AIM/RIM-7R configuration.

The Committee has been informed that the MHIP Program has experienced at least a 1-year delay due to technical problems with the signal processor. The Committee also notes that fiscal year 1991 appropriated funds for the MHIP Program have been offered as sources for reprogramming actions. The Committee, therefore, recommends providing \$30,258,000 for Sparrow missile modifications in fiscal year 1992, a reduction of \$23,000,000 from the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES

Weapons industrial facilities.—The Navy's fiscal year 1992 budget request includes \$31,575,000 for the modernization of Navy industrial facilities. The Committee recommends \$44,775,000 for this activity in fiscal year 1992, an increase of \$13,200,000 over the budget request and the House allowance.

The Committee provides this increase to continue the modernization of the Allegheny Ballistics Laboratory, a Government-owned, contractor-operated facility which produces propulsion units for the Navy.

OTHER ORDNANCE

Machine gun ammunition.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$23,500,000 over the budget request of \$8,196,000 for this item to enhance readiness, improve training, maintain the industrial base, and increase war reserves.

Practice bombs.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$2,788,000 in the Navy's \$5,800,000 request for 241,223 MK-76 sub-

caliber practice bombs. After submitting its budget request, the Navy reduced the planned procurement quantity for fiscal year 1992 to 123,700 bombs for \$3,000,000. Navy officials agreed with the GAO on this reduction.

CIWS ammunition.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$10,000,000 over the budget request of \$12,023,000 for this item to enhance readiness, improve training, maintain the industrial base, and increase war reserves.

Gator.—The Committee recommends a denial of the Navy's \$9,567,000 request for 321 CBU-78/B Gator weapons because the weapons cannot be produced within the fiscal year 1992 funded delivery period due to delays in producing two required components: a thermal battery and a Mk-7 mod 7 dispenser.

Other ship ammunition.—The Committee recommends a reduction in the Navy's \$5,100,000 request for 40 million 40 mm M-430 cartridges by \$2,506,000 because one-half of the cartridges cannot be produced within the fiscal year 1992 funded delivery period.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

Appropriations, 1991	\$10,160,804,000
Budget estimate, 1992	8,493,200,000
House allowance	10,595,704,000
Committee recommendation	7,725,382,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,725,382,000, a reduction of \$767,818,000 from the budget request and \$2,870,322,000 below the House allowance.

This appropriation provides funding for the construction; acquisition; conversion of vessels, including armor and armament; plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools for production plants and facilities; procurement of long-leadtime items; and designs of vessels.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The Committee recommendation provides funding for the purchase of one attack submarine, five destroyers, one amphibious ship, three mine warfare ships, as well as funding for spare and repair parts, service and landing craft, the impact of inflation on prior-year ships, and other ancillary items. The Committee adjustments are listed in the table below and described in the text which follows.

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY												
FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE SHIPS												
BA-1 FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE SHIPS												
TRIDENT (NUCLEAR).....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TRIDENT FIRE SAFETY IMPROVEMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL, FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE SHIPS.....												
OTHER WARSHIPS												
BA-2 OTHER WARSHIPS												
CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SSN-21.....	1	1,527,725		1	1,527,725		1	1,527,725				
SSN-21/SSN-688 (AP-CY).....	--	375,500		--	375,500		--	375,500				
CV SLEP.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
D0G-51.....	5	4,165,105		4	3,314,137		5	4,091,488		-73,617	+1	+777,351
D0G-51 (AP-CY).....	--	16,200		--	16,200		--	16,200				
TOTAL, OTHER WARSHIPS.....		6,084,530			5,233,562			6,010,913		-73,617		+777,351
AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS												
BA-3 AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS												
LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP (NYP).....	--	--	--	1	972,000		--	--	--	--	-1	-972,000
LSD-41 (CARGO VARIANT).....	1	245,134		1	245,134		1	241,118		-4,016		-4,016
TOTAL, AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS.....		245,134			1,217,134			241,118		-4,016		-976,016
MINE WARFARE AND PATROL SHIPS												
BA-4 MINE WARFARE + PATROL SHIPS												
MHC MINE HUNTER COASTAL.....	2	231,096		2	231,096		3	361,096		+130,000	+1	+130,000
TOTAL, MINE WARFARE AND PATROL SHIPS.....		231,096			231,096			361,096		+130,000		+130,000

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGR												
BA-5 AUXILIARIES, CRAFT + PY PROG COSTS												
TAGOS SURTASS SHIPS.....	1	540,110	1	149,000							-1	-149,000
AOE.....	1	500,000	1	500,000							-1	-500,000
OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS.....	2	129,818	1	41,200	2	129,818					+1	+88,618
SEALIFT/PREPOSITIONING.....				1,300,000								-1,300,000
SERVICE CRAFT.....		15,468		60,468								-45,000
LANDING CRAFT.....												
LCAC LANDING CRAFT.....	12	265,902	36	807,102	12	253,902					-24	-553,200
LCAC LANDING CRAFT (AP-CY).....												
OUTFITTING.....		275,150		275,150								-36,455
POST DELIVERY.....		175,153		175,153								-24,395
INFLATION FOR PRIOR YEARS PROGRAMS.....		524,900		599,900								-281,225
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION.....		5,939		5,939								
SHIP SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....												
TOTAL, AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGR.....		1,932,440		3,913,912		1,113,255				-819,185		-2,800,657
PRIOR YEAR SHIPBUILDING FUNDS.....												
DRDF DENY WILCON CAPITAL BUDGET.....						-1,000				-1,000		-1,000
TOTAL, SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY.....		8,495,200		10,595,704		7,725,382				-767,818		-2,870,322

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

SSN-21.—The budget requests \$1,527,725,000 to cover the unfunded costs of one SSN-21 submarine, the third of the class. The House provided the requested level and the Committee concurs in this recommendation.

The Committee is concerned with recently discovered welding problems experienced on the first SSN-21 submarine. The Navy attests this will delay delivery of the first submarine by 1 year, or possibly longer. In the meantime, the second SSN-21, funded in fiscal year 1991, is currently several months behind schedule due to a protest to the contract. During this period no construction work may begin on the submarine. It is estimated that additional delays will occur before work can commence on this submarine. Because of these delays the Committee seriously considered not funding the third SSN-21 in its recommendations. In its deliberations the Committee decided to recommend funding for program. Critical to this determination was the Secretary of the Navy's commitment to reexamine the Navy's projections for submarine production. The Secretary offered to review the Navy's plans for future submarine construction and to share those plans with the Congress.

Last year, the Committee directed the Navy to reexamine its acquisition strategy noting that the production rate was to be curtailed as a result of the major warship review. Since that time, the acquisition strategy has been reviewed and the Defense Department has decided to reduce the rate of production further. In addition, the Navy has recognized that the cost of the SSN-21 program may be prohibitive, and has indicated that it now intends to initiate a new, smaller, less costly submarine program, the *Centurion*, which is anticipated to begin procurement as early as 1997. Considering these changes, the Committee agrees with the Navy Secretary and believes DOD should again reassess its plans for the SSN-21 program.

The Committee recommends that the Defense Department reexamine its requirements and goals and consider procuring SSN-688 submarines in lieu of the SSN-21 submarines until the follow-on *Centurion*. The Committee is not offering direction that DOD choose either program, but thinks that the overall cost, threat changes and industrial base considerations warrant another look at this issue. The Committee expects the Defense Department to expedite this review and report to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services as soon as possible.

Submarine advance procurement.—The budget requests \$375,000,000 for SSN-21 advance procurement. The Committee recommends this amount; however, the Committee directs that these funds may be used either for additional SSN-21 or alternative submarine requirements. The Committee directs that the Navy not obligate any funding provided for advance procurement until the Defense Department has completed its review of the Navy's submarine program and reported back to the Congress.

DDG-51 destroyer.—The Committee recommends \$4,091,488,000 for procurement of five DDG-51 destroyers. This amount is \$73,617,000 below the budget and \$777,351,000 above the House allowance. The recommendation reduces funds for the program based

on an adjustment assumed in the Senate-passed authorization and an \$18,617,000 reduction based on lower inflation requirements.

LSD-41 (CV).—The Committee recommends \$241,118,000 for the LSD-41 CV program. The amount is \$4,016,000 below the budget based on changes in the amount required for contract escalation as estimated for the fiscal year 1991 program.

MHC-51.—The Committee recommends \$361,096,000 for the purchase of three MHC-51 ships as assumed in the Senate-passed authorization. This amount is \$130,000,000 above the budget request and House allowance.

Mine warfare ships.—The Committee remains concerned over the paucity of U.S. mine countermeasures capability. Like the Kuwaiti tanker escort operation, Desert Storm revealed significant mine warfare shortfalls. Mine damage to the U.S.S. *Princeton* and *Tripoli* stands as a graphic testimony to the shortfall of U.S. mine warfare capability.

To that end, the Committee desires a better understanding of the most cost-effective approach for acquiring mine warfare capability. Specifically, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services not later than April 1, 1992, addressing the following points: The life cycle cost of mine countermeasure [MCM] ships versus coastal mine hunters [MHC]; the cost of procuring MCM ships versus MHC ships or the coastal mine hunter variant [MHC(V)]; the capabilities and limitations of MCM, MHC, and MHC(V) vessels to include each vessel's ability to hunt mines and render mines inoperable by sweeping and influence measures; the interoperability of each with foreign navies; and the mission endurance of each vessel.

AOE.—In fiscal year 1991, the Congress provided funds for the fourth AOE, fast combat resupply ship. In its fiscal year 1992 budget, the Defense Department requests that these funds be reallocated for higher priority costs on prior-year shipbuilding programs. The Secretary of the Navy indicated to the Committee his desire to use these funds to pay the potential cost overruns on the first three funded AOE ships, and the Congress concurred in this allocation in the Fiscal Year 1991 Supplemental Appropriations Act. The Committee understands the low priority assigned to the AOE ship by the Navy Secretary. The mission of the AOE is to support aircraft carriers and the overall number of carriers is being reduced. Furthermore, the greatest need for AOE ships comes from conventional carriers and the Committee recognizes the Navy's plans would reduce conventional carriers significantly.

In its fiscal year 1992 request, the Defense Department includes funds to restore the ship already funded by the Congress. The Committee believes this request is inappropriate. If the Navy believes the AOE program is of such low priority that it can be eliminated in fiscal year 1991, the Committee does not understand why it should be funded in fiscal year 1992. Therefore, the Committee recommends no funding for this program. This amount is \$500,000,000 below the amount recommended by the House.

T-AGS 39 and T-AGS 40.—No funding has been recommended in this act for payment of an adjustment under Public Law 85-804 for the T-AGS 39 and T-AGS 40 as recommended by the House be-

cause this is not the appropriate vehicle for making such payments. However, the Navy is strongly encouraged to expeditiously resolve the current dispute regarding these ships in order that the conferees can provide any necessary and appropriate funding in the final Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1992.

LCAC landing craft.—The Committee recommends \$253,902,000 for procurement of 12 air cushion landing craft, a decrease of \$12,000,000 from the budget request and \$553,200,000 below the House. The Committee allowance reduces funding by \$12,000,000. The reduction is based on assumed savings resulting from competition. The budget requests an increase of \$22,000,000 in cost growth for this program, the allowance provides \$10,000,000 of this request.

Outfitting.—The Committee recommends \$238,695,000 for outfitting, \$36,455,000 below the budget request and the House allowance based on delays in ship deliveries.

Postdelivery.—The budget requests \$175,153,000 for postdelivery. The Committee recommendation provides \$150,758,000, reducing the request and House allowance by \$24,395,000 for delays in ship deliveries.

Escalation.—In fiscal year 1991, the conferees expressed concern that increasing costs should be covered through internal program adjustments; that is, reducing change orders, minimizing enhancements, and offering other programmatic reductions to lower overall ship cost. The Committee understands that the Navy has attempted to control costs accordingly. However, the Committee does not believe that the Navy efforts have been sufficient.

The Committee recommends \$318,675,000 for contract escalation for the impact of inflation on basic construction costs in prior-year ship construction and conversion projects. The amount provided is \$206,225,000 below the budget request and \$281,225,000 below the House allowance. The Committee understands that this amount is sufficient to cover requirements for fiscal year 1992. The Committee understands that this approach could raise questions about fully funding ship programs. The Committee wants it to be clear that it is not endorsing a change from the current policy.

Instead, the Committee offers this amount because it is not convinced in the veracity of the escalation requirements. For example, the budget requests an increase of \$36,400,000 for costs of inflation on the fiscal year 1985 SSN-688 program, but supporting budget documents only show an increase of \$5,949,000 identified as escalation increases. Further, other documentation provided to the Committee raises serious questions of the increased requirements for inflation since January 1990. The Committee finds it odd that escalation costs were not required for new appropriations in the recent past, but are now required in amounts in excess of \$500,000,000.

The Committee takes a dim view of providing separate appropriations for escalation and cost growth. Too often in the past these amounts have become passthrough appropriations used to balance accounting for several programs irrespective of the original justification for the funds. Therefore, in providing this amount, the Committee has allocated the funds to specific programs. The Committee directs that no internal realignments may be made in this allocation unless the Committee has been notified in advance. Further,

these funds are only to be used for escalation on basic construction contracts which have increased above the amounts listed in the fiscal year 1991 budget submission and as identified in the fiscal year 1992 or subsequent budget submissions. The specific allocation is as follows:

[in thousands of dollars]						
Program	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Trident	2,800	8,198	5,022	3,950	17,797	49,309
CVN				75,000		
SSN-688	5,949	45,550	6,124	16,857	28,259	
SSN-21					20,009	
DDG-51			719			22,317
LSD-41		1,324				
MHC-51					55	
AO (Jumbo)			400		449	
TAGOS			825		959	183
TAO	575	460	460			
Icebreaker						5,125

In addition to the funds provided for escalation, the Committee recommends a general provision, section 8092, which transfers funds among prior-year programs to cover other cost increases in ship construction and conversion programs.

DBOF adjustment.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$1,000,000 for DBOF.

Other House adjustments.—The Committee disagrees with other House adjustments as reflected in the table appearing in this chapter.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Appropriations, 1991	\$5,627,160,000
Budget estimate, 1992	6,471,200,000
House allowance	6,574,568,000
Committee recommendation	6,306,544,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,306,544,000, a decrease of \$164,656,000 below the President's budget and \$268,024,000 below the House allowance.

This appropriation finances the procurement of major equipment and weapons other than ships, aircraft, missiles, torpedoes, and guns. Equipments range from the latest electronic sensors for updating of naval forces to trucks, training equipment, and spare parts.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendations in comparison to the President's amended budget request and the House-passed bill:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY												
SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT												
SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT												
LM-2500 GAS TURBINE.....	--	12,735		--	12,735		--	12,735		--	--	--
ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE.....	1	4,437		1	4,437		1	4,437		--	--	--
STEAM PROPULSION IMPROVEMENT.....	--	4,110		--	4,110		--	4,110		--	--	--
OTHER PROPULSION EQUIPMENT.....	--	10,440		--	10,440		--	10,440		--	--	--
GENERATORS												
OTHER GENERATORS.....	--	33,676		--	33,676		--	33,676		--	--	--
PUMPS												
OTHER PUMPS.....	--	6,804		--	6,804		--	6,804		--	--	--
AIR COMPRESSORS												
HIGH PRESSURE AIR COMPRESSORS.....	--	185		--	185		--	185		--	--	--
PROPELLERS												
SUBMARINE PROPELLERS.....	17	10,770		17	10,770		17	10,770		--	--	--
OTHER PROPELLERS AND SHAFTS.....	--	2,036		--	2,036		--	2,036		--	--	--
NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT												
ELEC SUSPENDED CYRO NAVIGATOR.....	--	2,122		--	2,122		--	2,122		--	--	--
OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT.....	--	10,687		--	10,687		--	10,687		--	--	--
UNDERWAY REPLENISH EQUIP												
UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT.....	--	36,315		--	31,315		--	36,315		--	--	+5,000
PERISCOPES												
TYPE 18 PERISCOPES.....	--	11,382		--	11,382		--	11,382		--	--	--
PERISCOPES AND ACCESSORIES.....	--	1,048		--	1,048		--	1,048		--	--	--
OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT												
FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT.....	--	29,904		--	28,404		--	29,904		--	--	+1,500
COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD.....	--	4,160		--	4,160		--	4,160		--	--	--
POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT.....	--	29,964		--	29,964		--	29,964		--	--	--
SUBMARINE SILENCING EQUIPMENT.....	--	18,438		--	18,438		--	18,438		--	--	--
SURFACE SHIP SILENCING EQUIPMENT.....	--	6,390		--	6,390		--	6,390		--	--	--
SUBMARINE BATTERIES.....	30	13,804		30	13,804		30	13,804		--	--	--
STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	38,078		--	38,078		--	38,078		--	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
DSP EQUIPMENT.....	--	4,842	--	--	4,842	--	4,842	--	--	--	--	--
SEALIFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
AIR CONDITIONERS.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT.....	--	3,039	--	--	3,039	--	3,039	--	--	--	--	--
INMILE ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILLION.....	--	40,402	--	--	40,402	--	40,402	--	--	--	--	--
SURFACE IMA.....	--	8,091	--	--	8,091	--	8,091	--	--	--	--	--
DEGAUSSING EQUIPMENT.....	--	5,869	--	--	5,869	--	5,869	--	--	--	--	--
RADIOLOGICAL CONTROLS.....	--	333	--	--	333	--	333	--	--	--	--	--
MINI/MICROMINI ELECTRONIC REPAIR.....	--	707	--	--	707	--	707	--	--	--	--	--
CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS.....	664	5,902	664	664	5,902	664	5,902	664	5,902	--	--	--
SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	4	10,810	4	4	10,810	4	10,810	4	10,810	--	--	--
REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
REACTOR POWER UNITS.....	1	98,170	1	1	98,170	1	98,170	1	98,170	--	--	--
REACTOR COMPONENTS.....	--	269,341	--	--	269,341	--	269,341	--	--	--	--	--
OCEAN ENGINEERING.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT.....	--	6,543	--	--	6,543	--	6,543	--	--	--	--	--
NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE EQUIPMENT.....	--	3,371	--	--	3,371	--	3,371	--	--	--	--	--
SMALL BOATS.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
STANDARD BOATS.....	326	19,940	326	326	19,940	326	19,940	326	19,940	--	--	--
TRAINING EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT.....	--	7,929	--	--	7,929	--	7,929	--	--	--	--	--
PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PRODUCTION SUPPORT FACILITIES.....	--	8,588	--	--	8,588	--	8,588	--	--	--	--	--
OPERATING FORCES IPE.....	--	15,120	--	--	15,120	--	15,120	--	--	--	--	--
OTHER SHIP SUPPORT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS.....	--	189,086	--	--	189,086	--	189,086	--	--	--	--	--
DRDF DENY WILCON CAPITAL BUDGET.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MODERNIZATION SUPPORT.....	--	786,159	--	--	786,159	--	786,159	--	--	+93,000	--	+93,000
TOTAL, SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	1,751,727	--	--	1,745,227	--	1,844,727	--	--	+93,000	--	+99,500
COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SHIP RADARS.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
AN/SPS-40.....	--	21,831	--	--	21,831	--	21,831	--	--	--	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
AM/SPS-48.....	--	20,354	--	--	68,854	--	--	20,354	--	--	--	-48,500
AM/SPS-49.....	--	3,192	--	--	3,192	--	--	3,192	--	--	--	--
AM/SYS-(C).....	--	8,129	--	--	8,129	--	--	8,129	--	--	--	--
MK-23 TARGET ACQUISITION SYSTEM.....	2	21,101	--	2	19,401	--	2	21,101	--	--	--	+1,700
RADAR SUPPORT.....	--	10,057	--	--	10,057	--	--	9,257	--	-800	--	-800
SHIP SONARS												
SURFACE SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	21,948	--	--	21,948	--	--	17,611	--	-4,337	--	-4,337
AM/SQQ-69 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM.....	--	313,276	--	--	313,376	--	--	312,183	--	-3,093	--	-1,193
AM/BOG-5.....	--	165,848	--	--	165,848	--	--	89,566	--	-76,282	--	-76,282
SURFACE SONAR WINDOWS AND DOME.....	--	12,246	--	--	12,246	--	--	12,246	--	-4,000	--	-4,000
SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	15,711	--	--	15,711	--	--	15,711	--	--	--	--
SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS.....	--	29,744	--	--	29,744	--	--	29,744	--	--	--	--
FBN SYSTEM SONARS.....	--	2,192	--	--	2,192	--	--	2,192	--	--	--	--
ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT												
SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM.....	--	19,350	--	--	18,250	--	--	19,350	--	--	--	+1,100
SSTD.....	--	27,882	--	--	27,882	--	--	27,882	--	--	--	--
ACOUSTIC COMMUNICATIONS.....	--	195	--	--	195	--	--	195	--	--	--	--
SUBMARINE ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEM.....	--	192,328	--	--	192,328	--	--	192,328	--	--	--	--
SOGUS.....	--	78,153	--	--	78,153	--	--	78,153	--	--	--	--
FDS.....	--	4,000	--	--	4,000	--	--	4,000	--	--	--	--
LAMPS MK I ASW SUPPORT.....	--	---	--	--	---	--	--	---	--	--	--	--
AM/SQR-18 TOWED ARRAY SONAR.....	--	---	--	--	5,000	--	--	---	--	--	--	-5,000
AM/SQR-15 TOWED ARRAY SONAR.....	--	---	--	--	---	--	--	---	--	--	--	--
SURTASS.....	--	31,051	--	--	31,051	--	--	31,051	--	--	--	--
ASW OPERATIONS CENTER.....	--	30,752	--	--	30,752	--	--	27,679	--	-3,073	--	-3,073
CARRIER ASW MODULE.....	--	9,943	--	--	9,943	--	--	9,943	--	--	--	--
ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT												
AM/SLQ-32.....	--	116,385	--	--	116,385	--	--	112,085	--	-4,300	--	-4,300
AM/SSQ-95.....	--	---	--	--	12,000	--	--	---	--	-12,000	--	-12,000
AM/MLR-1.....	--	3,356	--	--	3,356	--	--	3,356	--	--	--	--
AM/MLR-8.....	--	8,092	--	--	8,092	--	--	8,092	--	--	--	--
ICAD SYSTEMS.....	--	5,875	--	--	5,875	--	--	5,875	--	--	--	--
EW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	9,943	--	--	9,943	--	--	9,943	--	--	--	--
C-3 COUNTERMEASURES.....	--	21,398	--	--	19,498	--	--	21,398	--	--	--	+1,900
RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT												
COMBAT OF.....	1	10,091	--	1	10,091	--	--	974	-1	-9,117	-1	-9,117
OUTBOARD.....	--	5,620	--	--	5,620	--	--	5,620	--	--	--	--
NAVAL INTELL PROCESSING SYSTEM.....	--	18,324	--	--	16,024	--	--	18,324	--	--	--	+2,300

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
ENI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION.....	--	11,840	--	--	11,840	--	--	11,840	--	--	--	--
SHORE ELEC ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILLION.....	--	10,267	--	--	10,267	--	--	7,263	--	-3,004	--	-3,004
SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS												
SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS.....	--	65,046	--	--	44,546	--	--	65,046	--	--	--	+20,500
FLIGHT DECK COMMUNICATIONS.....	--	1,405	--	--	1,405	--	--	--	--	-1,405	--	-1,405
PORTABLE RADIOS.....	--	22,182	--	--	10,000	--	--	20,182	--	-2,000	--	+10,182
SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION.....	--	43,985	--	--	43,985	--	--	23,141	--	--	--	--
SHIP COMM ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILLION.....	--	23,141	--	--	23,141	--	--	23,141	--	--	--	--
SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS												
SHORE LF/VLF COMMUNICATIONS.....	--	7,420	--	--	2,420	--	--	5,915	--	-1,505	--	+3,495
VERDIN.....	--	2,648	--	--	2,648	--	--	2,648	--	--	--	--
SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT.....	--	12,596	--	--	12,596	--	--	12,596	--	--	--	--
COMPACT VLF RECEIVER.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS												
SATCOM SHIP TERMINALS.....	--	167,489	--	--	167,489	--	--	157,963	--	-9,526	--	-9,526
SATCOM SHORE TERMINALS.....	--	36,677	--	--	36,677	--	--	36,677	--	--	--	--
SHORE COMMUNICATIONS												
JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT.....	--	2,406	--	--	2,406	--	--	2,406	--	--	--	--
ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS.....	--	650	--	--	650	--	--	650	--	--	--	--
SHORE HF COMMUNICATIONS.....	--	28,685	--	--	28,685	--	--	24,876	--	-3,809	--	-3,809
DCS TECH CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS.....	--	2,719	--	--	2,719	--	--	2,719	--	--	--	--
VOICE FREQ CARRIER TELEGRAPH.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
NAVCES COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT.....	--	11,646	--	--	11,646	--	--	11,646	--	--	--	--
SHORE COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION.....	--	6,048	--	--	6,048	--	--	6,048	--	--	--	--
SHORE COMM ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILLION.....	--	1,397	--	--	1,397	--	--	1,397	--	--	--	--
CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT												
STU-111.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SECURE VOICE SYSTEM.....	--	67,988	--	--	66,988	--	--	61,688	--	-6,300	--	-5,300
SECURE DATA SYSTEM.....	--	55,623	--	--	55,623	--	--	51,520	--	-4,103	--	-4,103
TSEC/KG-84.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TSEC/KY-57/58 (VINSON).....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TSEC/KY-5 (ANDVT).....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TSEC/KG-81 (WALBURN).....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TSEC/KG-96 (TSS).....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
BLACKER CRYPTO.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TRITAC CRYPTO.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TSEC/KGV-11.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

[[In thousands of dollars]]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
KEY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS.....	--	9,630		--	9,630		--	9,630		--	--	--
SIGNAL SECURITY.....	--	421		--	421		--	421		--	--	--
CRYPTOGRAPHIC ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILLION.....	--	2,436		--	2,436		--	2,436		--	--	--
TSEC/KGV-S.....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT												
CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT.....	--	2,645		--	2,645		--	2,645		--	--	--
CRYPTOLOGIC ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILLION.....	--	2,010		--	2,010		--	2,010		--	--	--
CRYPTOLOGIC RESERVES EQUIPMENT.....	--	721		--	721		--	721		--	--	--
CRYPTOLOGIC FIELD TRAINING EQUIPMENT.....	--	543		--	543		--	543		--	--	--
SHORE CRYPTOLOGIC SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT												
WAR RESERVE.....	--	8,440		--	8,440		--	8,440		--	--	--
ELECT. ENGINEERED MAINTENANCE.....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
COMMO/ELECTRONICS PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS.....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
DRUG INTERDICTION												
OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT.....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
TOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT.....	--	2,443,582		--	2,447,246		--	2,288,505		-155,077	--	-158,741
AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT												
SONOBUOYS												
AN/SSQ-36 (BT).....	--	77,531		--	70,379		--	77,531		--	--	+7,152
AN/SSQ-53 (OIFAR).....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
AN/SSQ-62 (DICASS).....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
GENERAL INCREASE - SONOBUOYS.....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
AN/SSQ-77 (VLAD).....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
SIGNAL, UNDERWATER SOUND (SUS).....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
ROCKEYE BOMBS.....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--
AIR LAUNCHED ORDNANCE												
CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVELOPMENT.....	--	18,367		--	18,367		--	18,367		--	--	--
AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS.....	--	6,964		--	6,964		--	6,964		--	--	--
AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES.....	--	65,033		--	64,288		--	70,033		+5,000	--	+5,745
MARINE LOCATION MARKERS.....	--	6,537		--	6,537		--	6,537		--	--	--
DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY MATERIAL.....	--	3,674		--	3,674		--	3,674		--	--	--
JATOS.....	--	8,061		--	8,061		--	8,061		--	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget		House		Committee recommendation		Senate compared to--	
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Budget amount	House amount
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	59,800	--	59,800	--	59,800	--	--
WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	4,843	--	4,843	--	4,843	--	--
EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS.....	--	16,375	--	16,375	--	16,375	--	--
AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT.....	--	46,640	--	46,640	--	46,640	--	--
CATAPULTS AND ARRESTING GEAR.....	--	33,008	--	29,608	--	33,008	--	+3,400
METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT.....	--	1,354	--	1,354	--	1,354	--	--
OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT.....	--	6,432	--	6,432	--	6,432	--	--
AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT.....	--	1,004	--	1,004	--	1,004	--	--
AIRBORNE NINE COUNTERMEASURES.....	--	8,638	--	8,638	--	8,638	--	--
LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT.....	--	1,764	--	1,764	--	1,764	--	--
REASON PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT.....	--	2,253	--	2,253	--	2,253	--	--
OTHER SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT.....	--	10,186	--	10,186	--	10,186	--	--
TOTAL, AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	378,464	--	367,167	--	383,464	+5,000	+16,297
ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT								
SHIP GUN AMMUNITION								
SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT.....	--	14,749	--	14,749	--	14,749	--	--
GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT	--	12,463	--	11,000	1	37,463	+1	+26,463
MK-92 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM.....	--	28,990	--	28,990	--	28,990	--	--
HARPOON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	19,610	--	19,610	--	19,610	--	--
TERRIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	28,926	--	18,126	--	28,926	--	+10,800
TARTAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	18,007	--	18,007	--	18,007	--	--
POINT DEFENSE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	1,195	--	1,195	--	1,195	--	--
AIRBORNE ECM/ECON.....	--	46,950	--	46,950	--	46,950	--	--
AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	53,533	--	53,533	--	53,533	--	+7,500
SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	3,397	--	3,397	--	3,397	--	--
SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	64,333	1	43,733	1	64,333	--	+20,600
VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS.....	1	--	4	20,000	--	--	-4	-20,000
RAM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
FBN SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	26,610	--	26,610	--	26,610	--	--
STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	57,414	--	57,414	--	57,414	--	--
STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
STRATEGIC ORDNANCE DISPOSAL.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget		House		Committee recommendation		Senate compared to--	
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Budget amount	House amount
ASU SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MC-117 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	--	56,796	--	56,796	--	56,796	--	--
SUBMARINE ASU SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	13,495	--	13,495	--	13,495	--	--
SURFACE ASU SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	19,952	--	19,952	--	19,952	--	--
ASU RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	11,567	--	11,567	--	11,567	--	--
OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIPMENT	--	11,023	--	11,023	--	11,023	--	--
UNARMED SEABORNE TARGET	--	5,304	--	5,304	--	5,304	--	--
ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM	--	5,090	--	5,090	--	5,090	--	--
CALIBRATION EQUIPMENT	--	1,079	--	1,079	--	1,079	--	--
STOCK SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	--	1,816	--	1,816	--	1,816	--	--
OTHER ORDNANCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	--	2,772	--	2,772	--	2,772	--	--
OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
FLEET MINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	13,970	--	13,970	--	13,970	--	--
MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES	--	2,865	--	2,865	--	2,865	--	--
DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY MATERIAL	--	1,514	--	1,514	--	1,514	--	--
SHIP EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURE	--	26,537	--	26,537	--	26,537	--	--
TOTAL, ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	549,757	--	529,394	--	574,757	+25,000	+45,363
CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ARMORED SEDANS	--	159	--	159	--	159	--	+159
PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	435	6,970	435	6,970	435	6,970	--	--
GENERAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	--	14,105	--	14,105	--	14,105	--	--
GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	--	21,234	--	21,234	--	21,234	--	--
TRAILERS/TRUCK TRACTORS	--	4,999	--	4,999	--	4,999	--	--
EARTH MOVING EQUIPMENT	131	8,327	131	8,327	131	8,327	--	--
CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT	--	5,779	--	5,779	--	5,779	--	--
FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	44	5,943	44	5,943	44	5,943	--	--
WEIGHT HANDLING EQUIPMENT	14	2,708	14	2,708	14	2,708	--	--
AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	--	86,049	--	86,049	--	86,049	--	-6,000
COMBAT CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	2,460	--	2,460	--	2,460	--	--
MOBILE UTILITIES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	2,283	--	2,283	--	2,283	--	--
COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT	--	9,726	--	9,726	--	9,726	--	--
OCEAN CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	--	1,337	--	1,337	--	1,337	--	--
FLEET MOORINGS	--	3,135	--	3,135	--	3,135	--	--
POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	--	10,509	--	10,509	--	10,509	--	--
OTHER CIVIL ENG SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	6,552	--	6,552	--	6,552	--	--
TOTAL, CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	192,275	--	198,116	--	192,275	--	-5,841

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget		House		Committee recommendation		Senate compared to--		House amount
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	
SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
FORKLIFT TRUCKS.....	--	7,036	--	7,036	--	7,036	--	--	--
OTHER MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT.....	--	4,330	--	4,330	--	4,330	--	--	--
AUTOMATED MATERIALS HANDLING SYSTEM.....	--	525	--	525	--	525	--	--	--
OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	2,457	--	2,457	--	2,457	--	--	--
POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION.....	--	17,633	--	17,000	--	17,633	--	--	+633
SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS.....	--	131,737	--	129,108	--	131,737	--	--	+2,629
TOTAL, SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	163,718	--	160,456	--	163,718	--	--	+3,262
PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TRAINING DEVICES	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SURFACE SONAR TRAINERS.....	--	1,707	--	1,707	--	1,707	--	--	--
SUBMARINE SONAR TRAINERS.....	--	3,815	--	3,815	--	3,815	--	--	--
SURFACE COMBAT SYSTEM TRAINERS.....	--	1,506	--	1,506	--	1,506	--	--	--
SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEM TRAINERS.....	--	6,067	--	6,067	--	6,067	--	--	--
SHIP SYSTEM TRAINERS.....	--	36,926	--	36,926	--	36,926	--	--	--
TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	5,736	--	5,736	--	5,736	--	--	--
TRAINING DEVICE MODIFICATIONS.....	--	57,120	--	57,120	--	57,120	--	--	--
COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	+1,500
EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	22,701	--	21,201	--	22,701	--	--	--
MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	15,549	--	15,549	--	15,549	--	--	--
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	35,824	--	35,824	--	35,824	--	-3,500	+2,465
ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILLION.....	--	42,138	--	36,173	--	38,638	--	--	--
OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	981	--	981	--	981	--	--	--
NAVAL RESERVE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	23,182	--	23,182	--	23,182	--	--	--
OCEANOGRAPHIC SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	2,845	--	2,845	--	2,845	--	--	--
ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	+10,000	+10,000
PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT.....	--	13,417	--	13,417	--	23,417	--	--	--
INDUSTRIAL DEPOT MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT.....	--	26,782	--	26,782	--	26,782	--	--	--
COMPUTER ACQUISITION PROGRAM	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-58,150
COMPUTER ACQUISITION PROGRAM.....	--	126,965	--	129,715	--	71,565	--	-55,400	-44,979
ADP/CIM REDUCTION.....	--	--	--	--	--	-44,979	--	-44,979	--
PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAMS	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT (PIF).....	--	52,183	--	52,183	--	52,183	--	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget		House		Committee recommendation		Senate compared to--	
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Budget amount	House amount
PROD ENH INCENT FUND (PEIF).....	--	844	--	844	--	844	--	--
TOTAL, PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	476,288	--	471,573	--	382,409	-93,879	-89,164
SPARES & REPAIR PARTS.....	--	515,389	--	470,389	--	515,389	--	+45,000
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
REDUCTION, EXCESS REPROGRAMMING.....	--	--	--	185,000	--	--	--	-185,000
DBOF ADJUSTMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	-38,700	-38,700	-38,700
DENY DBOF MILCON CAPITAL BUDGET.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY.....	--	6,471,200	--	6,574,568	--	6,306,544	-164,656	-268,024

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT

Reactor power unit.—The Committee understands that within funds requested for this program, \$98,170,000 is included for a spare reactor for the SSN-21. The Committee believes that delays in the SSN-21 program have reduced the requirement for this program in fiscal year 1992, but is recommending funds for industrial base considerations. Although the House has also recommended this amount, the Committee intends to reexamine this matter in conference.

Modernization support.—The Navy has requested \$786,159,000 to support the fiscal year 1992 requirements for the fleet modernization program. The Committee recommends providing \$879,159,000 for modernization support activities, \$93,000,000 more than the budget request and the House allowance.

The fleet modernization program is designed to upgrade ships of the fleet to be mission capable in countering current and projected threats, improving operational capabilities, and comply with mandated requirements. The justification for the addition of \$93,000,000 for this activity is fully explained within the operation and maintenance section of this report.

COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT

Radar support.—The Navy budget request includes \$10,057,000 for the purchase and installation of radar support equipment to enhance equipment performance as well as increase reliability and maintainability of these equipments. In fiscal year 1992, equipment installation costs increase by more than 160 percent over the fiscal year 1991 program, yet the number of equipments to be installed decreases. The Navy has not adequately justified its fiscal year 1992 equipment installation cost estimates. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$800,000.

Surface sonar support equipment.—The Navy budget request includes \$21,948,000 for the procurement and installation of various surface sonar upgrade kits intended to increase maintainability and supportability of sonar equipment. As part of this request, the Navy intended to procure 12 shallow water active kits in fiscal year 1991 and 7 additional kits in fiscal year 1992. These kits were to provide mine detection and shallow water antisubmarine warfare capability for the AN/SQS-53A sonar. The Navy has provided information that indicates only seven shallow water active kits are now required. Therefore, fiscal year 1992 acquisition, equipment installation, and other associated costs are not necessary. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$4,337,000 in fiscal year 1992. In addition, the fiscal year 1991 rescission list includes a reduction for the five shallow water active kits that are excess to the fiscal year 1991 appropriated program.

AN/SQQ-89(V) surface antisubmarine warfare combat system.—The Navy budget request includes \$315,276,000 to procure and install the AN/SQQ-89 sonar systems aboard surface ships. This system is a fully integrated system with the capability to detect, classify, track, and coordinate submarine targets with the ship's

combat direction system. Part of these funds are spent on contractor production engineering and support costs from year to year. Since this program is mature, these costs should be consistent from year to year. Fiscal year 1992 production engineering and support costs grow by an amount in excess of inflation over previous years' efforts. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$3,093,000 to reflect more stable efforts in production engineering and support.

AN/BQQ-5 sonar.—The Navy budget request includes \$165,848,000 to procure and install AN/BQQ-5 sonar system upgrades for SSN-637 and SSN-688 class submarines. In its request, the Navy is planning to procure sonar upgrade kits to convert AN/BQQ-5 B and C version sonars to an E configuration. Based on analysis of prior-year deliveries and missed installation schedules, the fiscal year 1992 acquisition of B and C conversion kits does not need to occur in order to fulfill planned installations for fiscal years 1994 and 1995. Due to the incongruity of the procurement, delivery, and installation schedules, the Committee recommends a reduction of \$76,282,000. Included in this recommendation is an adjustment to production engineering and support for excessive growth in the amount of \$2,200,000.

Surface ship sonar windows and domes.—The Navy budget request includes \$12,246,000 for the replacement of sonar domes and windows that crack or fail during operation. Sonar dome failures are a function of fleet population and predicted failure rates. The fiscal year 1992 program increases nearly 20 percent over the fiscal year 1991 program. Based on planned force structure reductions in the future, this program should be decreasing. In addition, recent improvements in sonar dome and window splicing techniques have resulted in no failures to these objects since their introduction to the fleet in 1985. The Navy has not been able to support the budgeted increase in requirements. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$4,000,000.

AN/SLQ-32(V).—The Navy budget request includes \$116,385,000, of which \$5,200,000 is for a new start for the rapid antiship missile integrated defense system [RAIDS]. The Navy has indicated that it did not know the extent of the program at the time of the budget submission, but now have fit within the available funding the purchase of two engineering development models [EDM's], three trainers, and nine operational RAIDS systems. Until this system has been appropriately developed and tested, it does not appear prudent to purchase more than two EDM's and two trainers in fiscal year 1992. Accordingly, the Committee recommends a reduction of \$4,300,000.

Navy tactical data system [NTDS].—The Navy budget request includes \$56,718,000 for the purchase of general purpose combat direction systems to permit rapid integration of ship sensor information, analysis and display of tactical information, and designation of weapon systems for use against force threats. CV/CVN-related equipments being bought in fiscal year 1992 will not be needed for installation until late fiscal year 1994. The 18-month manufacturing leadtime indicates that these systems do not need to be procured until fiscal year 1993 while still supporting installation schedules. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$3,192,000.

Flight deck communications.—The Navy budget request includes \$1,405,000 for the purchase of ancillary material to support AN/SRC-47 secure voice communications equipment aboard aircraft carriers. Last year, the Navy budgeted funds to procure AN/SRC-47 equipment as well as ancillary material. Since that time, the Navy has only purchased ancillary material. The current budget proposes to procure additional ancillary material in fiscal year 1992. However, the Navy will not procure AN/SRC-47 equipment until fiscal year 1993. Since it appears that ancillary material is being bought in advance of need, the Committee recommends a reduction of \$1,405,000.

Portable radios.—The Navy budget request includes \$22,182,000 for the purchase of single-channel ground and airborne radio sets [SINCGARS] to support unique Navy missions. The Army is the executive agent for the SINCGARS radio and procures this radio for all services within the Department. Based on prices provided from the Army for the radios in question, the Navy has overbudgeted its request for funding. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$2,000,000 to reflect pricing adjustments in accordance with expected procurement costs for SINCGARS radios.

Shore low-frequency/very low-frequency [LF/VLF] communications.—The Navy budget request includes \$7,420,000 for the consolidation of its TACAMO communications facilities at Tinker Air Force Base and for the service life extension program [SLEP] of its various shore LF/VLF transmitter sites worldwide. Cost estimates provided for the conversion of the Yosami, Japan, transmitter site in fiscal year 1992 are less than the amounts originally identified in the budget. Based on revised cost estimates, the Committee recommends a reduction of \$1,505,000.

Satellite communication [SATCOM] ship terminals.—The Navy has included in its budget request \$167,489,000 for the purchase and installation of shipboard terminal equipment for ship-to-ship, ship-to-shore, and ship-to-aircraft tactical communications via Earth orbiting satellites. The budget request portrayed delivery schedules for the AN/WSC-6 OM-55 as requiring greater time than that necessary to receive equipment. Use of the correct lead-times allows for one of the systems to be procured with fiscal year 1993 funds instead of fiscal year 1992 funds and still meet required installation dates (allowing for a reduction of \$4,963,000). Furthermore, the fiscal year 1991 contract award for secure voice interoperability equipment will not occur until at least September 1991. As a result, the fiscal year 1992 program may be deferred (allowing for a reduction of \$4,563,000). The Committee recommends a total reduction of \$9,526,000.

Shore high-frequency [HF] communications.—The Navy budget request includes \$28,685,000 for the upgrade or replacement of HF antennas, transmitters, and receivers because of an inability to support mission performance or due to prohibitive maintenance costs for existing systems. Based on manufacturing leadtimes associated with the AN/FRT-96 transmitter, in order to meet the fiscal year 1994 delivery dates, these items do not need to be procured until fiscal year 1993. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$3,809,000.

Secure data systems.—The Navy budget request includes \$55,623,000 for the purchase of standard cryptographic devices. The cost to the Navy for secure data systems has historically been lower than amounts requested in the budget. By using fiscal year 1991 contract prices plus adding for inflation, the Navy appears to be requesting funds in excess of those necessary to meet proposed item purchases. Accordingly, the Committee recommends a reduction of \$4,103,000.

Equipments being purchased for bases/functions being closed or realigned.—The Navy budget request includes the purchase of equipment for several installations/facilities which have been identified as part of the base closure and realignment list that has been forwarded to Congress for approval. Since the necessity for this equipment is in doubt, the Committee recommends the following reductions:

ASW operations center	—\$3,073,000
Air station support equipment	—430,000
Navy command and control system—ashore	—1,401,000
Shore electronic items under \$2,000,000	—3,004,000
Total	—7,908,000

Poor obligation rates/program execution performance.—The Committee recommends the following programs for reductions due to poor program performance in fiscal year 1991:

Combat DF	—\$9,117,000
SSEP	—1,000,000
Other training	—6,300,000
FACSFAC	—2,500,000
TADIX-B	—3,600,000
Secure voice system (ANDVT)	—6,300,000
Total	—28,817,000

ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT

MK-92 fire control system.—The Department of the Navy has requested \$12,463,000 to support the MK-92 fire control system in fiscal year 1992. The Committee recommends providing \$37,463,000 for this program in fiscal year 1992, \$25,000,000 more than the budget request and \$26,463,000 more than the House allowance.

While the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations statements have consistently expressed a need to improve the FFG-7-class frigates air defense capability, the Navy has not seen fit to budget for this modernization effort. The Senate Armed Services Committee [SASC] has taken the initiative to authorize sufficient funding in fiscal year 1992 to procure an additional two MK-92 fire control systems in fiscal year 1992 pending the successful completion of operational testing of the system. The Committee supports the SASC's initiative, however, only provides \$25,000,000 to procure one system in fiscal year 1992. The Committee expects that if the MK-92 fire control system successfully completes operational testing and meets all required specifications, the Navy may use the additional authorization provided to reprogram funds to procure an additional system in fiscal year 1992. The Committee further expects the Department of the Navy to budget for the MK-92 fire control system in fiscal year 1993.

OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends incorporating the following adjustments to the budget estimate, in accordance with the Senate authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Air expendable countermeasures.....	65,033	64,288	70,033	+ 5,000	+ 5,745
Environmental support equipment.....	13,417	13,417	23,417	+ 10,000	+ 10,000
Deny DBOF Milcon capital budget.....			- 38,700	- 38,700	- 38,700

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

Appropriations, 1991	\$719,141,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,039,400,000
House allowance	1,043,218,000
Committee recommendation.....	1,100,570,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,100,570,000, an increase of \$61,170,000 above the President's budget request and \$57,352,000 above the House allowance.

This appropriation provides the Marine Corps with funds for the procurement, delivery, modification of missiles, armament, ammunition, communication equipment, tracked combat and wheeled vehicles, and various support equipment and spares.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendations in comparison to the President's amended budget request and the House-passed bill:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget		House		Committee recommendation		Senate compared to--	
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Budget amount	House amount
PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS								
AMMUNITION								
5.56 MM, ALL TYPES.....	--	24,832	--	24,832	--	24,832	--	--
7.62 MM, ALL TYPES.....	--	40,744	--	40,744	--	40,744	--	--
LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES.....	--	6,420	--	6,420	--	6,420	--	--
.50 CALIBER.....	--	38,285	--	38,285	--	38,285	--	--
40 MM, ALL TYPES.....	--	107,491	--	107,491	--	62,191	-65,300	-45,300
60 MM ILLUM M721.....	--	18,000	--	18,000	--	18,000	--	--
60 MM SMOKE WP.....	--	5,500	--	5,500	--	5,500	--	--
60 MM HE M855.....	--	13,220	--	13,220	--	13,220	--	--
81 MM HE.....	--	34,559	--	34,559	--	34,559	--	--
81 MM TP M879.....	--	7,000	--	7,000	--	7,000	--	--
CTG 105MM TP-1.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
120MM HEAT WP-T M830.....	--	36,143	--	36,143	--	26,843	-9,300	-9,300
120MM APCSDS-T M829E1.....	--	31,633	--	31,633	--	31,633	--	--
120MM TPCSDS-T M865.....	--	6,000	--	6,000	--	6,000	--	--
120 MM TP-T M831.....	--	5,092	--	5,092	--	--	-5,092	-5,092
155MM HE ADAM.....	--	40,200	--	40,200	--	80,400	+40,200	+40,200
155MM M864 PROJ BASEBURNER.....	--	53,000	--	53,000	--	53,000	--	--
155MM CHARGE WHITE BAG.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
155MM CHARGE GREEN BAG.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
FUZE, PD, M739A1.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
FUZE, PROXIMITY M732A2.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
FUZE, ET, XM762.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
FUZE, ET, XM767.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
83 MM ROCKET HEAA (SHAW).....	--	10,000	--	10,000	--	10,000	+10,000	-5,275
LIGHT ANTI-ARMOR WEAPON.....	--	35,277	--	35,277	--	30,002	+26,725	--
25MM HEI-T.....	--	13,164	--	13,164	--	13,164	--	--
25MM, TP-T, M793.....	--	1,400	--	1,400	--	1,400	--	--
CTG 25MM APDS.....	--	3,737	--	3,737	--	3,737	--	--
9 MM ALL TYPES.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
GRENADES, ALL TYPES.....	--	14,714	--	14,714	--	14,714	--	--
AMMO MODERNIZATION.....	--	10,150	--	10,150	--	10,150	--	--
OTHER SUPPORT								
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MIL.....	--	9,650	--	9,650	--	9,650	--	--
TOTAL, AMMUNITION.....	--	526,211	--	566,211	--	541,444	+15,233	-24,767

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES												
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES												
AAV7A1 PIP.....	--	12,268	--	--	12,268	--	--	12,268	--	--	--	--
MODIFICATION KITS (TRKD VEH).....	--	1,000	--	--	1,000	--	--	1,000	--	--	--	--
ITEMS UNDER \$2M (TRKD VEH).....	--	219	--	--	219	--	--	219	--	--	--	+219
ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS												
MOD KITS (ARTILLERY).....	--	600	--	--	600	--	--	600	--	--	--	--
ITEMS UNDER \$2M (ALL OTHER).....	--	280	--	--	280	--	--	280	--	--	--	--
WEAPONS												
MACHINE GUN, 50 CAL M2.....	321	2,416	321	321	2,416	321	321	2,416	--	--	--	--
M60E3 PIP.....	--	8,409	--	--	8,409	--	--	8,409	--	--	--	--
SNAR PIP.....	--	5,185	--	--	5,185	381	381	5,185	--	--	--	--
MK-19 40MM MACHINE GUN.....	381	5,185	381	381	5,185	381	381	5,185	--	--	--	--
TOTAL, WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES.....		30,377			30,158			30,377				+219
GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT												
GUIDED MISSILES												
HAWK MOD.....	--	8,709	--	--	2,500	--	--	8,709	--	--	--	+6,209
AAWS-MED.LUN.....	--	3,963	--	--	5,200	--	5	5,200	--	-3,963	--	--
PEDISTAL MOUNTED STINGER (PMS).....	5	5,200	5	5	5,200	5	5	5,200	--	--	--	--
STINGER NIGHT SIGHTS.....	--	--	--	2,400	30,000	--	--	--	--	--	-2,400	-30,000
TOW.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MLRS LAUNCHERS.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MLRS ROCKETS.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OTHER SUPPORT												
MODIFICATION KITS.....	--	17,672	--	--	37,700	--	--	13,909	--	-3,963	--	-23,791
TOTAL, GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT.....												
COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT												
MANPACK RADIOS												
MANPACK RADIOS AND EQUIP.....	--	392	--	--	392	--	--	392	--	--	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget		House		Committee recommendation		Senate compared to--	
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Budget amount	House amount
VEHICLE MOUNTED RADIOS AND EQUIPMENT								
VEHICLE MTD RADIOS & EQUIPMENT (MYP)	--	39,320	--	39,320	--	39,320	--	--
AN/GRC-XXXX	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TSC-96 PIP FLEET SAT COM TERMINAL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TELEPHONE AND TELETYPE EQUIPMENT								
UNIT LEVEL CIRCUIT SWITCH (ULCS)	--	12,683	--	12,683	--	12,683	--	--
TACT COMM CENTER EQUIP	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
AN/PSG() DIGITAL COMM TERMINAL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT								
OSCILLOSCOPE	1,704	1,980	1,704	1,980	1,704	1,980	--	--
SWEEP GENERATOR	--	1,990	200	1,990	200	1,990	--	--
SIGNAL GENERATOR	200	9,041	--	5,041	--	5,041	-4,000	--
ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP (TEL)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT								
SINGLE CHAN GRD & AIR RADIO	--	50,200	--	50,200	--	50,200	--	--
OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)								
MODIFICATION KITS (TEL)	--	694	--	694	--	694	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2M (TEL)	--	1,850	--	1,850	--	1,850	--	--
COMMAND + CONTROL SYSTEMS (NOM-TEL)								
POS LOCATING RPTG SYSTEM (PLRS)	--	7,900	--	7,900	--	7,900	--	--
TACTICAL AIR OPER MODULE (TAOM)	--	--	4	27,000	--	--	--	-27,000
ADVANCED TACTAIR COMMAND CENTR	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MARINE TACTICAL C2	--	7,285	--	7,285	--	7,285	--	--
ALL SOURCE IMAGERY PROCESSOR (JSIPS TAL)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
INTEL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NOM-TEL)								
LEMDO	--	27,600	--	--	--	--	-1	-27,600
SENIOR WARRIOR	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
JSTARS TERMINALS	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TACTICAL GROUND INTERCEPT FACILITY	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
COMMANDERS TACTICAL TERMINAL - HYBRID	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
COMMANDERS TACTICAL TERMINAL - RECEIVE ONLY	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TACTICAL RECONNAISSANCE INITIATIVE	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	17,052	--	17,052	--	17,052	--	--
MOD KITS (INTEL)	--	4,194	--	4,194	--	4,194	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2M (INTEL)	--	1,570	--	1,570	--	1,570	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget		House		Committee recommendation		Senate compared to--	
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Budget amount	House amount
REPAIR + TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ELECTRONIC TONE REPAIR FACILITY.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MECH TEST THDE.....	--	875	--	875	--	875	--	--
ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
THERMAL IMAGING EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)	--	9,491	--	9,491	--	9,491	--	--
NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT.....	--	16,297	--	16,297	--	16,297	--	--
ADP EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)	--	945	--	945	--	945	--	--
TEST CALIB & MAINT SPT.....	--	16,715	--	16,715	--	16,715	--	--
MODIFICATION KITS (NONTEL).....	--	1,614	--	1,614	--	1,614	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2K (NONTEL).....	--	229,688	--	225,088	--	198,088	-31,600	-27,000
TOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT.....		=====		=====		=====	=====	=====
SUPPORT VEHICLES								
ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES	45	1,950	45	1,950	45	1,950	--	--
COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES.....	--	9,000	--	9,000	--	9,000	--	--
COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TACTICAL VEHICLES	1,264	40,304	1,264	40,304	1,264	40,304	--	--
5/AT TRUCK HMMV (HYP).....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
M876 TRUCK MAINTENANCE, TELEPHONE/UTILITY.....	--	--	--	--	--	85,000	+85,000	+85,000
FMTV.....	127	13,780	127	13,780	127	13,780	--	--
LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM.....	--	7,909	--	7,909	--	7,909	--	--
TRAILERS.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OTHER SUPPORT	--	3,700	--	3,700	--	3,700	--	--
MODIFICATION KITS.....	--	435	--	435	--	435	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MIL.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL, SUPPORT VEHICLES.....		=====		=====		=====	+85,000	+85,000
ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ENGINEER AND EQUIPMENT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
M-9 ACE.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	House amount	
TOWED ASSAULT BRIDGE.....	--	5,512	--	--	5,512	--	--	5,512	--	--	--	--
ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT FUEL SYSTEM.....	--	3,167	--	--	3,167	--	--	3,167	--	--	--	--
TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEM (TFS) EQUIPMENT.....	--	7,307	--	--	7,307	--	--	7,307	--	--	--	--
TOPOGRAPHIC/SURVEY EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TRAY RATION HEATING SYSTEM.....	--	--	--	--	--	40	--	6,500	+40	+6,500	--	+6,500
TOWED ASSAULT BRIDGE.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT.....	--	1,000	--	--	1,000	--	--	1,000	--	--	--	--
COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	616	--	--	616	--	--	616	--	--	--	--
AMPHIBIOUS RAID EQUIPMENT.....	--	8,762	--	--	8,762	--	--	8,762	--	--	--	--
PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT.....	--	1,093	--	--	1,093	--	--	1,093	--	--	--	--
PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT.....	--	3,000	--	--	3,000	--	--	3,000	--	--	--	--
GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP.....	--	1,000	--	--	1,000	--	--	1,000	--	--	--	--
WAREHOUSE MODERNIZATION.....	--	2,297	--	--	2,297	--	--	2,297	--	--	--	--
MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP.....	--	7,388	--	--	7,388	--	--	7,388	--	--	--	--
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
GENERAL PROPERTY.....	142	2,100	142	142	2,100	--	--	2,100	--	--	--	--
LIGHTWEIGHT DECONTAMINATION SYSTEM.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
DRY CHEMICAL FIRE EXTINGUISHER.....	--	6,798	--	--	6,798	--	--	6,798	--	--	--	--
TRAINING DEVICES.....	--	7,992	--	--	7,992	--	--	7,992	--	--	--	--
SHELTER FAMILY.....	--	5,898	--	--	5,898	--	--	5,898	--	--	--	--
CONTAINER FAMILY.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OTHER SUPPORT.....	--	1,865	--	--	1,865	--	--	1,865	--	--	--	--
MODIFICATION KITS.....	1	214	1	1	214	--	--	214	--	--	--	--
CHEMICAL AGENT MONITOR.....	--	7,574	--	--	7,574	--	--	7,574	--	--	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MIL.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MARITIME PREPOSITIONING EQUIPMENT.....	--	2,400	--	--	2,400	--	--	2,400	--	--	--	--
INDUSTRIAL/DEPOT MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL, ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT.....	--	75,983	--	--	75,983	--	--	82,483	--	+6,500	--	+6,500
SPARES & REPAIR PARTS.....	--	82,191	--	--	31,000	--	--	72,191	--	-10,000	--	+41,191
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS.....	--	1,039,400	--	--	1,043,218	--	--	1,100,570	--	+61,170	--	+57,352

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

AMMUNITION

40 mm, all types.—The Committee recommends a reduction in the Marine Corps' \$88,100,000 request for 6.9 million 40 mm HEDP M-430 cartridges by \$43,700,000 for 3.45 million cartridges because only about one-half of the requested quantity are scheduled to be produced within the fiscal year 1992 funded delivery period. The Committee recommends an additional reduction in the Marine Corps' \$5,600,000 request for 182,000 40 mm white star parachute cartridges by \$1,600,000 because the requirement for this item has decreased.

120 mm HEAT, MP-T M-830.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$9,300,000 in the Marine Corps' \$36,143,000 request for 5,400 120 mm HEAT MP-T M-830 cartridges by \$9,300,000 because the requirement for this item has decreased.

120 mm, TP-T, M-831.—The Committee recommends a denial of the Marine Corps' \$5,092,000 request for 120 mm TP-T M-831 cartridges because of a decision not to purchase this item in fiscal year 1992.

155 mm HE, ADAM.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$40,200,000 over the budget request for the 155 mm HE, ADAM to enhance readiness, improve training, maintain the industrial base, and increase war reserves.

83 mm rocket HEAA [SMAW].—The Committee recommends \$10,000,000 for the procurement of 24,000 SMAW rockets to enhance readiness and sustainability.

Light antiarmor weapon.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$24,725,000 over the budget request of \$5,277,000 for the procurement of additional light antiarmor weapons to enhance readiness and sustainability.

Terminally guided antiarmor mortar projectile [TAMP].—The Department did not request any funding to initiate the terminally guided antiarmor mortar projectile program in fiscal year 1992. The Committee understands the Marine Corps is examining plans to evaluate an off-the-shelf, nondevelopmental round within available fiscal year 1992 funds to validate field requirements and basic weapon performance.

The Committee supports this nondevelopment evaluation as a possible means to improve the combat effectiveness of light infantry forces. The Committee requests to be provided information on the results of the evaluation and any programmatic recommendations which may result.

GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT

Advanced antitank weapons system—medium [AAWS-M].—The Marine Corps has budgeted \$3,963,000 for the procurement of long lead items for the first year's production of the AAWS-M.

The Committee has been informed of a delay in the AAWS-M's development program of at least 1 year. As a result of these development delays, no procurement funding will be needed in fiscal year 1992. The Committee, therefore, recommends the denial of all procurement funding in this budget request.

COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT

Senior Warrior.—The Marine Corps budget request includes \$27,600,000 for the purchase of a tactical airborne signal intelligence collection and direction finding system. Based on the required need date in fiscal year 1994 and procurement lead times associated with the acquisition of this system, funding is not required until fiscal year 1993. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$27,600,000.

Surveillance thermal imaging system.—Congress provided \$15,000,000 within the fiscal year 1991 Desert Shield/Storm supplemental to allow the Marine Corps to continue to procure commercially available surveillance thermal imaging systems for helicopter operations. The Committee has been informed that the funds provided for this continued procurement were incorrectly appropriated to a Marine Corps ground force account rather than to an aviation program element. The Committee, therefore, rescinds the funds provided in fiscal year 1991 for surveillance thermal imaging systems and provides an additional appropriation of \$15,000,000 of new budget authority within the H-1 series modification of aircraft procurement line item for fiscal year 1992.

The Committee again directs the Department to procure off-the-shelf equipment with extensive airborne operational and production history, which currently reside in the military inventory or have a military nomenclature, and meet environmental standards and specifications. Because of the enhanced flight safety provided by these systems, the Committee expects the Marine Corps to commence procurement as soon as funds are made available.

TACTICAL VEHICLES

FMTV.—The Committee recommends providing an additional \$85,000,000 to the Marine Corps tactical truck program to begin the procurement of the family of medium tactical vehicles [FMTV]. The FMTV are the replacement vehicles for the aging fleet of 2½- and 5-ton trucks. The Committee strongly supports the FMTV program and believes that the Marine Corps should accelerate their planned participation in the program rather than continue to procure or modify the current fleet of medium trucks.

ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT

Towed assault bridge.—The Committee recommends providing an additional \$6,500,000 for the procurement of 40 rapidly deployable towed assault bridges for the Marine Corps. It is the Committee's understanding that the total Marine towed assault bridge requirement is 52 units and that, along with prior-year procurements, the fiscal year 1992 funding provided will buy out the total inventory requirement.

SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS

Spares and repair parts.—The Marine Corps included \$82,191,000 within the amended budget request for the procurement of spares and repair parts in fiscal year 1992. The Committee provides

\$72,191,000 for this activity, \$10,000,000 below the budget request and \$41,191,000 above the House allowance.

The Committee recommends a reduction of the \$10,000,000 in initial spares associated with the delay in the senior warrior program and the lack of requirement for these spares in fiscal year 1992.

OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends incorporating the following adjustments to the budget estimate, in accordance with the Senate authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]					
Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Electronic test equipment [TEL].....	9,041	5,041	5,041	- 4,000	

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Appropriations, 1991	\$9,541,455,000
Budget estimate, 1992	11,115,500,000
House allowance	7,444,121,000
Committee recommendation	10,349,396,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$10,349,396,000, a reduction of \$766,104,000 from the budget request and \$2,905,275,000 above the House allowance.

This appropriation finances the construction, procurement, modernization, and modification of aircraft and equipment, including armor and armament, specialized ground-handling equipment, and flight training simulators, spare parts, and accessories; specialized equipment; and expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The Committee recommendation for Air Force aircraft programs recognize that substantial force structure reductions will reduce the need for new aircraft purchases. The Committee continues to support the Air Force efforts to acquire advanced aircraft and has recommended reductions in funding for production and modernization of older systems to protect newer systems. In this regard, the Committee supports the plan as agreed to by the Senate in the authorization bill to terminate the F-16 aircraft. Similarly, the Committee has supported the B-2 program and denied funding to modernize older bombers. In addition to these actions, the Committee has made several reductions based on schedule changes and reduced costs than those assumed in the budget request. The funding recommended is listed in the table below. The specific adjustments are described in the text which follows.

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	House amount	Qty.
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE												
COMBAT AIRCRAFT												
STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE												
B-1B (MYP).....	--	107,895	--	--	62,595	--	--	--	--	-107,895	--	--
B-2A (MYP).....	4	2,456,028	--	--	--	4	4	2,456,028	--	--	+4	+2,456,028
B-2A (MYP) (AP-CY).....	--	455,268	--	--	--	--	--	455,268	--	--	--	+455,268
TACTICAL FORCES												
F-15 E.....	--	169,657	--	--	169,657	--	--	169,657	--	--	--	--
(BY TRANSFER).....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	(722,200)	--	--	--	--
F-16 C/D (MYP).....	48	1,073,187	48	48	1,073,187	--	--	73,187	-48	-1,000,000	-48	(+722,200)
F-16 C/D (MYP) (AP-CY).....	--	78,100	--	--	78,100	--	--	--	--	-78,100	--	-78,100
F-117.....	--	--	--	--	--	24	24	1,027,000	+24	+1,027,000	+24	+1,027,000
TOTAL, COMBAT AIRCRAFT.....	--	4,340,135	--	--	1,383,539	--	--	4,181,140	--	-158,995	--	+2,797,601
AIRCRAFT AIRCRAFT												
TACTICAL AIRLIFT												
C-17 (MYP).....	6	1,975,203	6	6	1,975,203	4	4	1,424,000	-2	-551,203	-2	-551,203
C-17 (MYP) (AP-CY).....	--	222,424	--	--	222,424	--	--	122,424	--	-100,000	--	-100,000
OTHER AIRLIFT												
C-27A.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
C-130H.....	8	245,479	8	8	245,479	9	9	272,979	+1	+27,500	+1	+27,500
C-130H (AP-CY).....	--	120,421	--	--	--	--	--	120,421	--	+120,421	--	+120,421
LC-130H.....	--	--	--	--	--	2	2	92,000	+2	+92,000	+2	+92,000
TOTAL, AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT.....	--	2,563,527	--	--	2,443,106	--	--	2,031,824	--	-531,703	--	-611,282
TRAINER AIRCRAFT												
OPERATIONAL TRAINERS												
ENHANCED FLIGHT SCREENER.....	38	8,478	38	38	14,012	38	38	14,012	--	+5,534	--	--
TANKER, TRANSPORT, TRAINER SYSTEM.....	37	167,420	34	34	156,246	34	34	156,246	-3	-11,174	--	--
TOTAL, TRAINER AIRCRAFT.....	--	175,898	--	--	170,258	--	--	170,258	--	-5,640	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
OTHER AIRCRAFT												
HELICOPTERS												
HH-60G.....	6	23,535		6	23,535		6	23,535				
MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT												
CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C.....	27	1,974		27	1,974		27	1,974				
E-8B.....	--	--		--	--		--	--				
E-8B (AP-CY).....	--	62,700		--	62,700		--	125,400		+62,700		+62,700
VC-137 REPLACEMENT AIRCRAFT.....	--	7,012		--	7,012		--	7,012				
TOTAL, OTHER AIRCRAFT.....		95,221			95,221			157,921		+62,700		+62,700
MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT												
STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT												
B-2A.....	--	1,652		--	1,652		--	1,652				
B-1B.....	--	195,647		--	140,147		--	115,700		-79,947		-24,447
B-1B ECM.....	--	--		--	--		--	--				
B-52.....	--	56,907		--	31,107		--	31,107		-25,800		--
TACTICAL AIRCRAFT												
A-10.....	--	391		--	391		--	391				
F-15.....	--	294,537		--	294,537		--	297,037		+2,500		+2,500
F-16.....	--	250,985		--	250,985		--	253,985		+3,000		+3,000
F-111.....	--	74,140		--	74,140		--	74,140				
F-117.....	--	--		--	--		--	85,000		+85,000		+85,000
TR-1A.....	--	55,101		--	55,101		--	--		-55,101		--
T/AT-37.....	--	14,448		--	14,448		--	14,448				
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT												
C-5.....	--	68,471		--	68,471		--	68,471				
C-9.....	--	1,374		--	1,374		--	1,374				
C-17A.....	--	1,618		--	--		--	--		-1,618		--
C-21.....	--	100		--	100		--	100				
C-23 AIRCRAFT.....	--	--		--	--		--	--				
C-57OL.....	--	602		--	602		--	602				
C-137.....	--	3,220		--	3,220		--	3,220				
C-141.....	--	45,203		--	45,203		--	105,203		+60,000		+60,000

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
TRAINER AIRCRAFT												
T-38.....	--	29,460	--	--	29,460	--	--	29,460	--	--	--	--
T-41 AIRCRAFT.....	--	201	--	--	201	--	--	201	--	--	--	--
T-43.....	--	9,412	--	--	9,412	--	--	9,412	--	--	--	--
OTHER AIRCRAFT												
KC-10A (ATCA).....	--	3,612	--	--	3,612	--	--	3,612	--	--	--	--
C-12.....	--	201	--	--	201	--	--	201	--	--	--	--
C-18.....	--	121	--	--	121	--	--	121	--	--	--	--
C-20 MODS.....	--	121	--	--	121	--	--	121	--	--	--	--
VC-25A MOD.....	--	201	--	--	201	--	--	201	--	--	--	--
C-130.....	--	78,273	--	--	78,273	--	--	78,273	--	--	--	--
C-135.....	--	465,108	--	--	465,108	--	--	426,808	--	-38,300	--	-38,300
E-3.....	--	50,897	--	--	50,897	--	--	50,897	--	--	--	--
E-4.....	--	6,362	--	--	6,362	--	--	6,362	--	--	--	--
H-3 AIRCRAFT SYSTEM.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
H-60.....	--	602	--	--	602	--	--	602	--	--	--	--
OTHER AIRCRAFT.....	--	46,920	--	--	46,920	--	--	46,920	--	--	--	--
OV-10.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OTHER MODIFICATIONS												
CLASSIFIED PROJECTS.....	--	56,254	--	--	22,273	--	--	68,254	--	+12,000	--	+45,981
CIVIL RESERVE AIRLIFT FLEET (CRAF)												
CIVIL RESERVE AIRLIFT FLEET (CRAF).....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT.....	--	1,812,141	--	--	1,695,242	--	--	1,773,875	--	-38,266	--	+78,633
AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS												
AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS.....	--	984,465	--	--	689,765	--	--	770,865	--	-213,600	--	+81,100
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	--	984,465	--	--	689,765	--	--	770,865	--	-213,600	--	+81,100

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget		House		Committee recommendation		Senate compared to--	
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Budget amount	House amount
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES								
COMMON AGE.....	--	469,335	--	280,493	--	468,535	--	+188,042
INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS.....	--	11,759	--	11,759	--	11,759	--	--
WAR CONSUMABLES.....	--	25,456	--	25,456	--	25,456	--	--
OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES.....	--	445,331	--	419,750	--	562,731	+117,400	+142,981
COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT.....	--	192,232	--	192,232	--	192,232	--	--
COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	-700	-700	-700
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES.....		1,144,113		929,690		1,260,013	+115,900	+330,323
RETIREMENT OF OBSOLETE AIRCRAFT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
DBOF ADJUSTMENT.....	--	--	--	37,300	--	--	--	-37,300
DBOF DENV MILCON CAPITAL BUDGET.....	--	--	--	--	--	3,500	+3,500	+3,500
DBOF TECHNICAL CORRECTION.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE.....		11,115,500		7,444,121		10,349,396	-766,104	+2,905,275
TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE.....		11,115,500		7,444,121		11,071,596	-43,904	+3,627,475

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENT

B-1B.—The Committee recommends no funding for the B-1B as assumed in the Senate-passed authorization bill. The authorization bill directs the Air Force to reexamine the B-1B program in light of its questionable penetration capability. The Committee has raised questions over this issue for the past several years and thus, concurs in this approach. The House provided \$62,595,000 for this program.

B-2 bomber.—The Committee recommendation provides \$2,911,296,000, the amount requested for the B-2 bomber. The House provided no funds for this program. Recent reports regarding the stealthy characteristics of the B-2, following certain testing, have led the Committee to review carefully the B-2 program. At the present time the Air Force has not fully examined the results of the testing to ascertain the exact effect on the program. The Air Force and Defense Secretary have reaffirmed their support for the program and note that, even with the testing problem, the aircraft is still the most survivable aircraft in the world. This comparison includes the F-117 which has proven itself to be nearly impossible to shoot down.

Nonetheless, the Committee is concerned with the testing results. At this time, the Air Force is unable to explain the cause of the test problem or fully assess its implications. While the Air Force is confident that this problem, if unresolved, would have little effect on the ability of the B-2 to perform effectively, it is clear to the Committee that the issue is not insignificant and remains unresolved.

Therefore, the Committee recommendation restricts the obligation of funds in this appropriation for B-2 procurement. The Committee has incorporated bill language which allows for the obligation of no procurement funds for the B-2 unless and until a supplemental appropriation bill is enacted which approves the obligation of funds. In addition, the language restricts obligations until the Secretary of Defense certifies the performance characteristics of the B-2 as required in the Senate-passed authorization bill.

F-15E support equipment.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$722,200,000 for the F-15E program to be derived by transfer from the A-12 program to pay for the unfunded support costs of the F-15E aircraft. This amount is in addition to the \$169,657,000 provided in the President's request and House allowance.

F-16.—The Committee recommends \$73,187,000 for the F-16 program. As provided in the Senate-passed authorization these funds could only be used for termination costs on the F-16 program. The House provided the amount requested for procuring 48 aircraft, \$1,073,187,000, with an additional \$78,100,000 for advance procurement.

The Committee understands that Air National Guard F-16 squadrons using older model F-16's served during Operation Desert Shield and performed admirably. Noting that these units were called up ahead of many active duty squadrons, the Committee believes that these units should possess the best equipment available. For that reason, the Committee directs that F-16 aircraft sched-

uled to be delivered to the Air Force during fiscal year 1992 be turned over to those National Guard F-16's units which served in Operation Desert Storm.

F-117.—The Committee notes the outstanding performance of the F-117 in Operation Desert Storm and concurs in the Senate-passed authorization guidance to procure an additional 24 aircraft. The Committee provides \$1,027,000,000 for this purpose.

C-17.—The Committee is concerned with the progress made on the C-17 program. In its fiscal year 1991 action, the Committee reduced funding for this program noting that it was unlikely that it could proceed as scheduled considering ongoing delays. It is indeed unfortunate that delays continue to plague the program. The Committee recognizes the need to improve airlift capabilities, noting though that this requirement is not as urgent as the need to upgrade sealift capability. The Committee recommends continuing the C-17 program. The Senate-passed authorization bill provides for four C-17 aircraft. The Committee recommends \$1,424,000,000 to procure these aircraft. This amount is \$551,203,000 below the budget request and the House allowance.

C-17 advance procurement.—The budget requests \$222,424,000 for advance procurement on the C-17. The Committee recommends \$122,424,000, a reduction of \$100,000,000 noting continued delays.

C-130H.—The Committee recommends \$272,979,000 for purchase of nine C-130H aircraft. This amount includes the eight requested and an additional aircraft required by the Air National Guard in Hawaii.

LC-130.—The Committee recommends \$92,000,000 for purchase of two LC-130 aircraft to replace those used by the Air National Guard. The two aging aircraft are to be turned over to the Navy for use in supporting U.S. personnel in the Antarctic.

B-1B modifications.—The budget requests \$195,647,000 for the modifications on the B-1B. The Committee recommends \$115,700,000, a reduction of \$79,947,000 and \$24,447,000 below the House allowance. The funds recommended are the same level as assumed in the Senate-passed authorization bill, and represent reductions for advanced stores carriage, simulator updates, and 1122 improvements. Funding is provided for safety modifications as requested.

B-52 modifications.—The Committee recommends \$31,107,000 for B-52 modifications, the same as the House allowance and \$25,800,000 below the budget request. The recommendation deletes modifications for Harpoon missile integration and integrated conventional stores management system because these programs have been delayed.

Advanced video recorders.—The Committee recommends increasing funding for F-15 and F-16 modifications by \$2,500,000 and \$3,000,000 respectively, for purchase of lighter weight advanced video recorders. One of the problems discovered in Operation Desert Storm was a lack of reliable bomb damage assessment. These new recorders will help overcome this shortcoming. This issue was not addressed by the House.

F-117 stealth fighter reconnaissance mods.—Desert Shield validated the requirements for manned tactical reconnaissance on the modern battlefield. Operational limits cited by the theater CINC

regarding battlefield reconnaissance capabilities during Desert Storm are a source of major concern to Committee. The primary tactical asset in theater, the RF-4C, filled the gap with a Vietnam-era sensor suite. However, target imagery was not always optimum and the processing delay in producing and distributing target photos was unacceptable.

Various options are available to upgrade the F-117A, which are affordable and use-proven technologies. The upgrade can take two forms: palletized loads which can be mounted in a 4-hour time-frame, or a fully airframe-integrated system. The cost difference between the two versions is estimated at about 5 percent of program costs, so the selection of the palletized versus integrated system depends on operational considerations as determined by the Department.

The Committee proposes to follow the lead of the Senate Armed Services Committee in providing a new program to outfit the stealth fighter with a state-of-the art, sophisticated reconnaissance package. Such a package would provide great versatility into this battle-proven asset, adding a dimension of reconnaissance which provides all-weather, day-night, realtime capability with proven technology—the ATARS with a data link, as well as a synthetic aperture radar. The Committee proposes \$85,000,000 for this purpose. The funding proposed for fiscal year 1992 would provide one-half the necessary funding to outfit 20 stealth fighters with this advanced capability.

An additional \$15,000,000 has been included in R&D to support this activity.

C-135 modifications.—The Committee recommends \$426,808,000 for C-135 modifications. This amount is \$38,300,000 below the President's request and House allowance reflecting a reduction assumed in the Senate-passed authorization bill.

The Committee recommendation provides the requested level for the KC-135R re-engining program. In addition, the Committee directs that \$143,195,000 available in fiscal year 1990 and 1991 resulting from the denial of the omnibus reprogramming should be used only for increasing the KC-135R program. The specific funds to be added to the existing KC-135R program are \$68,985,000 from fiscal year 1991 and \$74,210,000 from fiscal year 1990.

The Committee recognizes that the conference between the House and the Senate on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 may result in an authorized level of funding and quantity of aircraft to be modified to the KC-135R configuration exceeding that included in this section. The Committee anticipates funding the KC-135R re-engining program at the level reached in the authorization bill conference.

Civil reserve air fleet.—The Committee is concerned with the lift capability existing in the Defense Department and believes the Air Force should reexamine the civil reserve air fleet [CRAF] program to augment its other airlift assets. The age and material condition of the C-141 along with delays in the C-17 have heightened the Committee's interest in investing in additional CRAF assets. Further, the Committee understands that a significant portion of its CRAF aircraft could be lost due to bankruptcy of domestic air carriers. The Committee encourages the Air Force to enter into agree-

ments to protect these assets. The Committee would consider a re-programming to expand the CRAF fleet if sufficient resources are available.

Spare and repair parts.—The budget requests \$984,465,000 for purchase of spare parts. The Committee has made recommendations in this appropriation adjusting requirements for the F-16, F-117, C-17, classified programs, and certain modifications programs. In conjunction with these recommendations, the Committee recommends \$770,865,000 for spare and repair parts, a reduction of \$213,600,000 from the amount requested and \$81,100,000 above the House allowance.

Other authorization adjustments.—The Committee recommends several adjustments which were assumed in the Senate-passed authorization bill. These include: E-8B [JSTARS], +\$62,700,000; Enhanced flight screener, +\$5,534,000; TTTS, -\$11,174,000; C-17 modifications, -\$1,618,000; C-141 mods, +\$60,000,000; TR-1, -\$55,101,000; and DBOF, +\$2,500,000.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Appropriations, 1991	\$5,813,532,000
Budget estimate, 1992	5,599,800,000
House allowance	5,243,841,000
Committee recommendation	5,332,671,000

The Committee recommends an appropriations of \$5,332,671,000. This recommendation is \$267,129,000 below the President's budget request and \$88,830,000 above the House allowance.

This appropriation provides financing for the construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, rockets, spacecraft, and related equipment, including investment and repair parts, ground-handling equipment, and training devices; and the expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment, and installations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendations in comparison to the President's amended budget request and the House-passed bill:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE												
BALLISTIC MISSILES												
STRATEGIC PEACEKEEPER (M-X).....	--	195,178	--	124,200	--	566,100	--	370,922	--	+441,900	--	+441,900
(BY TRANSFER).....	--	--	--	--	--	(95,500)	--	(95,500)	--	(+95,500)	--	(+95,500)
MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC	--	45,645	--	45,645	--	45,645	--	--	--	--	--	--
MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC.....	--	240,823	--	169,845	--	611,745	--	+370,922	--	+441,900	--	+441,900
TOTAL, BALLISTIC MISSILES.....	--	441,001	--	339,690	--	1,123,490	--	741,867	--	741,867	--	741,867
OTHER MISSILES												
STRATEGIC ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE.....	120	433,688	120	433,688	120	433,688	120	433,688	120	433,688	120	433,688
ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE (AP-CY).....	--	68,100	--	68,100	--	68,100	--	68,100	--	68,100	--	68,100
NAVE MAP.....	32	34,662	32	34,662	32	34,662	32	34,662	32	34,662	32	34,662
AGM-131A SRAMII.....	--	10,969	--	10,969	--	10,969	--	10,969	--	10,969	--	10,969
AGM-131A SRAMII (AP-CY).....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TACTICAL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
AIM-9L/M SIDEWINDER.....	120	70,017	120	70,017	120	70,017	120	70,017	120	70,017	120	70,017
AGM-130 POWERED GBU-15.....	--	5,490	--	5,490	--	5,490	--	5,490	--	5,490	--	5,490
AGM-650 MAVERICK.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
AGM-650 MAVERICK PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS.....	465	113,151	465	113,151	465	113,151	465	113,151	465	113,151	465	113,151
AGM-88A HARM.....	700	653,232	1,000	768,432	700	497,032	700	497,032	700	497,032	700	497,032
AMRAAM.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TARGET DRONES	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TARGET DRONES.....	60	28,833	60	28,833	60	28,833	60	28,833	60	28,833	60	28,833
INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - OTHER	--	29,145	--	29,145	--	29,145	--	29,145	--	29,145	--	29,145
MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-OTHER.....	--	1,447,287	--	1,562,487	--	1,562,487	--	1,562,487	--	1,562,487	--	1,562,487
TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES.....	--	1,476,432	--	1,591,632	--	1,591,632	--	1,591,632	--	1,591,632	--	1,591,632

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES												
CLASS IV												
ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE.....	--	12,040	--	--	12,040	--	--	12,040	--	--	--	--
HAVE MAP.....	--	1,706	--	--	1,706	--	--	1,706	--	--	--	--
AIM-9 SIDEWINDER.....	--	872	--	--	872	--	--	872	--	--	--	--
MM 11/111 MODIFICATIONS.....	--	144,715	--	--	144,715	--	--	152,115	--	+7,400	--	+7,400
AGM-65D MAVERICK.....	--	4,402	--	--	4,402	--	--	4,402	--	--	--	--
AGM-88A HARM.....	--	2,147	--	--	2,147	--	--	2,147	--	--	--	--
AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE.....	--	27,950	--	--	27,950	--	--	27,950	--	--	--	--
PEACEKEEPER (N-X).....	--	2,370	--	--	2,370	--	--	2,370	--	--	--	--
MODIFICATIONS UNDER \$2.0M.....	--	324	--	--	324	--	--	324	--	--	--	--
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES.....	--	196,526	--	--	196,526	--	--	203,926	--	+7,400	--	+7,400
MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS												
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	--	104,279	--	--	90,062	--	--	104,279	--	--	--	+14,217
OTHER SUPPORT												
SPACE PROGRAMS												
SPACEBORNE EQUIP (CONSEC).....	--	7,873	--	--	7,873	--	--	7,873	--	--	--	--
GLOBAL POSITIONING (MYP).....	4	150,084	--	4	150,084	--	4	123,184	--	-26,900	--	-26,900
GLOBAL POSITIONING (MYP) (AP-CY).....	--	66,002	--	--	66,002	--	--	32,023	--	--	--	--
SPACE SHUTTLE OPERATIONS.....	--	32,023	--	--	32,023	--	--	29,500	--	--	--	--
SPACE SHUTTLE OPERATIONS (AP-CY).....	--	29,500	--	--	29,500	--	--	19,352	--	-88,700	--	-88,700
DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG (MYP).....	2	108,052	--	2	108,052	--	2	65,752	--	--	--	--
DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG (MYP) (AP-CY).....	--	65,752	--	--	65,752	--	--	55,724	--	--	--	--
DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (MYP).....	--	55,724	--	--	55,724	--	--	295,614	--	--	--	+100,000
DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (MYP) (AP-CY).....	--	295,614	--	--	195,614	--	--	183,040	--	--	--	--
DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM (MYP).....	--	183,040	--	4	183,040	--	4	38,986	--	--	--	--
SPACE BOOSTERS (MYP).....	--	38,986	--	--	38,986	--	--	582	--	--	--	--
SPACE BOOSTERS (MYP) (AP-CY).....	4	39,786	--	4	18,716	--	4	12,854	--	-21,100	--	-30
MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE.....	--	12,854	--	--	12,854	--	--	12,854	--	--	--	--
MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE (AP-CY).....	--	582	--	--	582	--	--	582	--	--	--	--
SPECIAL PROGRAMS												
FOREST GREEN.....	--	582	--	--	582	--	--	582	--	--	--	--
TONDS (MYP).....	4	39,786	--	4	18,716	--	4	12,854	--	-21,100	--	-30
TONDS (MYP) (AP-CY).....	--	12,854	--	--	12,854	--	--	12,854	--	--	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	House amount	
SPECIAL PROGRAMS.....	--	2,419,740	--	2,166,840	--	2,180,340	--	-239,400	--	--	+33,500	
SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS.....	--	72,679	--	72,679	--	72,679	--	--	--	--	--	
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	--	32,594	--	-7,800	--	32,594	--	--	--	--	+40,394	
TOTAL, OTHER SUPPORT.....	--	3,610,885	--	3,176,521	--	3,234,785	--	-376,100	--	-376,100	+58,264	
DBOF ADJUSTMENT.....	--	--	--	48,400	--	--	--	--	--	--	-48,400	
DBOF TECHNICAL CORRECTION.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
UNDISTRIBUTED INCREASE.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE.....	--	5,599,800	--	5,243,841	--	5,332,671	--	-267,129	--	-267,129	+68,830	

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

BALLISTIC MISSILES

Peacekeeper (MX).—The administration's amended budget request proposes to terminate MX missile production in fiscal year 1992, 5 years earlier than originally planned. The Committee does not support the administration's proposal and recommends providing an additional \$370,922,000 in new budget authority in fiscal year 1992.

This additional funding, along with available prior-year funds in the fiscal year 1991 "Missile procurement, Air Force" account of \$140,000,000 and a transfer of \$95,500,000 of available prior-year funds from the research and development, Air Force ICBM modifications program, should provide sufficient funding to procure 12 MX missiles in fiscal year 1992.

OTHER MISSILES

Maverick missile.—The Air Force has requested \$5,490,000 for logistic and contractor support for Maverick missiles in fiscal year 1992. The Committee supports this fiscal year 1992 request.

The Committee notes that Congress provided \$391,600,000 for the procurement of 5,291 Maverick missiles within the fiscal year 1991 Desert Shield/Storm supplemental. The Department has informed the Committee that the contract for these missiles was competitively awarded on July 19, 1991, in the amount of \$264,800,000. When the estimated Government costs of \$58,077,000 are added to the contract award, the total cost of this procurement is \$322,877,000. This is a savings of \$68,723,000 over the amounts provided within the supplemental appropriation. The Committee recommends the transfer of these excess prior year funds to the other procurement, Air Force electronics and telecommunications spares and repair parts program.

HARM missile.—The Air Force has requested \$113,151,000 for the procurement of 465 AGM-88A HARM missiles in fiscal year 1992. The Committee recommends no funding for HARM missiles in fiscal year 1992, \$113,151,000 below the amended budget request and the House allowance. The rationale for this recommendation can be found in the weapons procurement, Navy section of this report.

HAVE NAP.—The Committee is aware that the Strategic Air Command originally procured a limited number of HAVE NAP missiles to meet a specific targeting requirement. Ten of these missiles already have been fired while an additional 20 missiles may be used for follow-on operational, test, and evaluation [OT&E]. Aware that inventory requirements may continue to exist for these missiles, the Committee believes that the Secretary of the Air Force should present a request for the replacement of HAVE NAP missiles as part of the fiscal year 1993 budget submission of the Department of Defense to meet its inventory objective.

MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE MISSILES

Minuteman II/III missile modifications.—The Air Force has requested \$144,715,000 for the continued modification of Minuteman II/III missiles in fiscal year 1992. The Committee recommends \$152,115,000 for this activity, an addition of \$7,400,000 above the amended budget request and the House allowance.

The Committee has provided an additional \$7,400,000 above the budget request for revised estimates of the Minuteman modification requirements of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty [START]. These revised estimates were provided to the Committee by the Department of Defense and are fully explained within the operation and maintenance section of this report.

The Committee also recommends a transfer of \$19,600,000 of excess fiscal year 1991 funds to the other procurement, Air Force electronics and telecommunications spares and repair parts program. These funds are also available because of revised estimates of fiscal year 1991 requirements for the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty.

SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS

OTHER SUPPORT

Global positioning satellite [GPS].—The Air Force has included in their amended budget request \$150,084,000 for procurement and \$66,002,000 in advance procurement for the continuation of a multiyear procurement of global positioning satellites. The Committee recommends \$123,184,000 in procurement funding, a reduction of \$26,900,000 below the budget request and the House allowance. The Committee further recommends fully funding the advance procurement request for fiscal year 1992.

The General Accounting Office has reported to the Committee that the Air Force has programmed \$8,800,000 in termination liabilities to cover expected costs if the GPS multiyear contract is canceled in fiscal year 1992. The GAO has further reported to the Committee that cancellation of the global positioning satellite contract is extremely unlikely and thus the funds budgeted for termination liabilities are unneeded. The Committee recommends denying the \$8,800,000 programmed by the Air Force for GPS termination liabilities in fiscal year 1992.

The Air Force has informed the Committee that \$18,100,000 of the fiscal year 1992 request was programmed to fund the first increment of a requirement to operate the nuclear detonation [Nudet] detection system [NDS] through a stressed nuclear environment. However, the Air Force has informed the Committee that the funds required for this activity in fiscal year 1992 are needed in their "Research and development" account. The Committee, therefore, denies the use of procurement funding for the NDS operate through requirements in fiscal year 1992 and reduces the request by \$18,100,000.

Defense meteorological satellite program [DMSP].—The Air Force has requested \$108,052,000 within the fiscal year 1992 amended budget request to procure defense meteorological satellite program satellites Nos. 19 and 20. The Committee recommends providing

\$19,352,000 in support funding for the DMSP and no funding for satellite procurement. This funding level is \$88,700,000 below the amended budget request and the House allowance.

In 1989 the Air Force entered into a multiyear contract to procure DMSP satellites 16 through 20. To date, the Air Force has exercised options to procure satellites 16 through 18 and has budgeted \$91,700,000 in fiscal year 1992 to purchase the remaining two satellites.

The General Accounting Office [GAO] has reported to the Committee that based upon the DMSP program office's current launch and ground spare requirements, the procurement of satellites 19 and 20 could be delayed until fiscal year 1993 without adversely affecting operational capability. Under the current procurement schedule, satellites 19 and 20 would be in storage for 18 and 27 months, respectfully, before integration and testing began. Procuring the satellites in fiscal year 1993 would reduce the storage time by 6 and 15 months, respectively, and would not impact the current or planned dates that these satellites would be needed for launch.

The Air Force is currently negotiating cost and schedule changes to incorporate satellite mission capability upgrades for satellites Nos. 16 and 17. These negotiations, according to GAO, will result in delaying the delivery of these satellites up to 1 year. A corresponding delay in the deliveries of satellites 19 and 20 appears reasonable.

The GAO further reported that the DMSP program office disagreed with their recommendations because of potential cost growth for satellites 19 and 20. It should be noted, however, that the GAO did not report any disagreements by the Air Force that operational requirements would not be affected by delaying procurement of satellites 19 and 20 until fiscal year 1993.

The Committee fully supports the operational need for the DMSP and directs the Air Force to budget for the procurement of satellites 19 and 20 in fiscal year 1993.

Medium-launch vehicles.—In June 1991 the Air Force awarded a contract for the three Delta II rockets for \$7,000,000 less than the amounts authorized and appropriated by Congress for fiscal year 1991. The Committee, therefore, recommends a transfer of these excess prior year funds to the other procurement, Air Force electronics and telecommunications spares and repair parts program.

IONDS.—The General Accounting Office has reported that \$4,400,000 of fiscal year 1991 termination liability funding is still available to the program office. The Committee recommends transferring these excess fiscal year 1991 funds to the other procurement, Air Force electronics and telecommunications spares and repair parts program.

OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends incorporating the following adjustments to the budget estimate, in accordance with the Senate authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
AMRAAM missile.....	653,232	768,432	497,032	— 156,200	— 271,400

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Appropriations, 1991	\$7,503,356,000
Budget estimate, 1992	8,058,100,000
House allowance	8,001,524,000
Committee recommendation.....	7,859,296,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,859,296,000, a decrease of \$198,804,000 from the budget request and \$142,228,000 below the House allowance.

This appropriation provides for the procurement of weapons systems and equipment other than aircraft and missiles. Included are munitions, other weapons, vehicles, electronic and telecommunications systems for command and control of operational forces, and ground support equipment for weapons systems and supporting structure.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendation in comparison to the President's amended budget request and the House-passed bill:

[in thousands of dollars]

	Budget		House		Committee recommendation		Senate compared to--	
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Budget amount	House amount
OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE								
MUNITIONS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT								
ROCKETS + LAUNCHERS								
2.75 INCH ROCKET MOTOR.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2.75 INCH ROCKET HEAD - WP.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000.....	--	4,609	--	6,609	--	4,609	--	--
CARTRIDGES (THOUSANDS)								
5.56 MM.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
20 MM COMBAT.....	--	--	5,993	25,000	--	--	--	--
20MM TRAINING.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
30 MM TRAINING.....	5,216	44,379	5,216	44,379	5,216	44,379	--	--
CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-180.....	250,800	2,508	250,800	2,508	250,800	2,508	--	--
SIGNAL MK-4 MOD 3.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	-5,993	-25,000
CART TNP 3000 FT/LBS.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000.....	--	2,954	--	2,954	--	2,954	--	--
BOMBS								
MK-82 INERT/BDU-50.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	+13,800	+13,800
BSU-49 INFILATABLE RETARDER.....	15,039	5,450	15,039	5,450	15,039	5,450	--	--
BOMB HARD TARGET 2000LB.....	1,840	21,360	1,840	21,360	1,840	21,360	--	--
BSU-85 INFILATABLE RETARDER.....	14,655	14,120	14,655	14,120	14,655	14,120	--	--
BOMB AREA DENIAL 1000LB.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
LASER BOMB GUIDANCE KIT.....	265	17,565	831	55,100	265	17,565	-566	-37,535
GBU-15.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
BOMB PRACTICE BDU-38.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MK-84 BOMB-EMPTY.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SKEET/SENSOR FUZE WEAPON.....	98	108,650	98	108,650	98	108,650	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OTHER ITEMS								
FLARE, IR MJU-7B.....	141,411	6,637	141,411	6,637	141,411	6,637	--	--
PARACHUTE FLARE LUU-2 B/B.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MJU-23 FLARE.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MJU-108.....	147,570	7,454	147,570	7,454	147,570	7,454	--	--
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	--	8,039	--	8,039	--	8,039	--	--
SPECIAL PROGRAMS.....	--	14,546	--	14,546	--	14,546	--	--
MODIFICATIONS.....	--	3,758	--	3,758	--	3,758	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000.....	--	7,581	--	7,581	--	7,581	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS												
INTELLIGENCE DATA HANDLING SYS.	--	1,468	--	--	1,468	--	--	1,468	--	--	--	--
INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	--	7,119	--	--	7,119	--	--	7,119	--	--	--	--
INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP.	--	3,945	--	--	3,945	--	--	3,945	--	--	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	--	12,317	--	--	12,317	--	--	12,317	--	--	--	--
ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS												
AIR TRAFFIC CTRL/LAND SYS (ATCALS)	--	14,135	--	--	14,135	--	--	--	--	-14,135	--	-14,135
AIR TRAFFIC CTRL/LAND SYS PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TACTICAL AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVE	--	68,865	--	--	68,865	--	--	68,865	--	--	--	+4,500
WEATHER OBSERV/FORECAST	--	59,524	--	--	59,524	--	--	59,524	--	-20,615	--	-19,615
DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM	--	52,066	--	--	48,066	--	--	34,066	--	-18,000	--	-14,000
OTH-B RADAR	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SAC COMMAND AND CONTROL	--	35,929	--	--	31,329	--	--	6,521	--	-29,408	--	-24,808
CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	--	33,974	--	--	33,974	--	--	33,974	--	--	--	--
INTELS MODERNIZATION	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
NAVSTAR GPS	--	3,411	--	--	3,411	--	--	3,411	--	--	--	--
PACAF COMMAND/CONTROL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG.	--	16,806	--	--	9,106	--	--	7,306	--	-9,500	--	-1,800
MARS/USAF-FAA RADAR UPGRADE	--	54,535	--	--	54,535	--	--	54,535	--	--	--	--
TAC SIGINT SUPPORT	--	20,471	--	--	18,371	--	--	4,971	--	-15,500	--	-13,400
DIST EARLY WARNING RDR/NORTH WARNING	--	9,233	--	--	8,233	--	--	9,233	--	--	--	+1,000
TACTICAL GROUND INTERCEPT FACILITY	--	13,134	--	--	13,134	--	--	--	--	-13,134	--	-13,134
TR-1 GROUND STATIONS	--	41,955	--	--	41,955	--	--	110,155	--	+68,200	--	+68,200
DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
AIR BASE OPERABILITY	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
IMAGERY TRANS	--	22,843	--	--	22,843	--	--	343	--	-22,500	--	-22,500
TACTICAL WARNING SYSTEMS SUPPORT	--	614	--	--	614	--	--	614	--	--	--	--
NORTH ATLANTIC DEFENSE C3	--	5,118	--	--	5,118	--	--	5,118	--	--	--	--
SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS												
AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIP.	--	85,739	--	--	79,889	--	--	81,248	--	-4,491	--	+1,359
ADP OPERATIONS CONSOLIDATION	--	70,358	--	--	70,358	--	--	--	--	-70,358	--	-70,358
ADP/CIM REDUCTION	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2,342	--	-2,342	--	-2,342
WACRES/NTS ADEP	--	17,642	--	--	16,642	--	--	17,642	--	--	--	+1,000
NAC COMMAND AND CONTROL SUPPORT	--	16,851	--	--	16,851	--	--	9,651	--	-7,200	--	-7,200
AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	--	28,693	--	--	28,693	--	--	28,693	--	--	--	--
RANGE IMPROVEMENTS	--	51,665	--	--	46,665	--	--	86,665	--	+35,000	--	+40,000
C3 COUNTERMEASURES	--	2,855	--	--	2,855	--	--	2,855	--	--	--	--
JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
BASE LEVEL DATA AUTO PROGRAM	--	20,146	--	--	20,146	--	--	20,146	--	--	--	--
SATELLITE CONTROL FACILITY	--	27,836	--	--	27,836	--	--	25,836	--	-2,000	--	-2,000

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	House amount	
CONSTANT WATCH.....	--	5,457	--	--	5,457	--	--	2,657	--	-2,800	--	-2,800
CONSOLIDATED SPACE OPS CENTER.....	--	3,745	--	--	3,745	--	--	3,745	--	--	--	--
ESMC/NSMC 1EM.....	--	61,186	--	--	61,186	--	--	61,186	--	--	--	--
AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS												
PROGRAM 698AJ.....	--	8,732	--	--	8,732	--	--	8,732	--	--	--	--
INFORMATION TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS.....	--	59,841	--	--	59,841	--	--	52,241	--	-8,400	--	-7,600
TELEPHONE EXCHANGE.....	--	48,418	--	--	48,418	--	--	48,418	--	--	--	+1,000
JOINT TACTICAL COMM PROGRAM(MYP).....	--	5,019	--	--	5,019	--	--	5,019	--	--	--	--
USTRANSCOM.....	--	5,021	--	--	5,021	--	--	5,021	--	--	--	--
USCENTCOM.....	--	4,265	--	--	4,265	--	--	4,265	--	--	--	--
AUTOMATED TELECOMMUNICATIONS PRG.....	--	263,907	--	--	263,907	--	--	263,907	--	--	--	--
NITSTAR.....	--	7,581	--	--	7,581	--	--	7,581	--	--	--	--
SATELLITE TERMINALS.....	--	4,558	--	--	4,558	--	--	4,558	--	-17,546	--	-17,546
DCA PROGRAMS												
WIDEBAND SYSTEMS UPGRADE.....	--	17,546	--	--	17,546	--	--	17,546	--	--	--	--
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMER COMM NET.....	--	32,997	--	--	32,997	--	--	24,562	--	-8,435	--	-8,435
ORGANIZATION AND BASE												
TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT.....	--	2,268	--	--	2,268	--	--	2,268	--	+500	--	+500
RADIO EQUIPMENT.....	--	4,047	--	--	4,047	--	--	4,047	--	--	--	--
TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV).....	--	2,737	--	--	2,737	--	--	2,737	--	--	--	--
CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT.....	--	162,457	--	--	160,000	--	--	63,134	--	-99,323	--	-96,866
E + I REQUIREMENTS.....	--	500	--	--	500	--	--	(99,323)	--	(+99,323)	--	(+99,323)
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	--	9,726	--	--	9,726	--	--	500	--	+500	--	--
(BY TRANSFER).....	--		--	--		--	--	9,126	--	-600	--	-600
CAP COM & ELECT.....	--		--	--		--	--		--		--	
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000.....	--		--	--		--	--		--		--	
MODIFICATIONS												
COMM-ELECTRONICS CLASS IV.....	--	26,680	--	--	25,000	--	--	26,680	--	--	--	+1,680
ANTIJAM VOICE.....	--	30,061	--	--	30,061	--	--	30,061	--	--	--	--
COMM/ELECTRONICS PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS.....	--	12,286	--	--	12,286	--	--	12,286	--	--	--	--
SPACE SYSTEMS CLASS IV MODS.....	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--	--
TOTAL, ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP.....	--	1,629,681	--	--	1,587,494	--	--	1,567,594	--	-262,087	--	-219,900

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	QTY.	Amount	QTY.	QTY.	Amount	QTY.	QTY.	Amount	QTY.	Budget amount	House amount	QTY.
OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP												
TEST EQUIPMENT												
BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE.....	--	8,717	--	--	8,717	--	--	8,717	--	--	--	--
NEWARK AFS CALIBRATION PACKAGE.....	--	2,180	--	--	2,180	--	--	2,180	--	--	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000.....	--	23,367	--	--	23,367	--	--	23,367	--	--	--	--
PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIP												
NIGHT VISION GOGGLES.....	--	6,238	--	--	6,238	--	--	6,238	--	--	--	--
BREATHING APPARATUS TWO HOUR.....	--	6,239	--	--	6,239	--	--	6,239	--	--	--	--
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEF PROG.....	--	35,155	--	--	35,155	--	--	35,155	--	--	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000.....	--	3,253	--	--	3,253	--	--	3,253	--	--	--	--
DEPOT PLANT + MATERIALS HANDLING EQ												
BASE MECHANIZATION EQUIPMENT.....	--	9,105	--	--	9,105	--	--	9,105	--	--	--	--
AIR TERMINAL MECHANIZATION EQUIP.....	--	3,743	--	--	3,743	--	--	3,743	--	--	--	--
INDUSTRIAL/DEPOT MAINTENANCE EQUIPMT.....	--	10,788	--	--	10,788	--	--	10,788	--	--	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000.....	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--	--
ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT												
GENERATORS-MOBILE ELECTRIC.....	--	---	--	--	---	--	--	---	--	--	--	--
FLOODLIGHTS SET TYPE NF20.....	--	11,159	--	--	11,159	--	--	11,159	--	--	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000.....	--	2,169	--	--	2,169	--	--	2,169	--	--	--	--
BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT												
BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT.....	--	33,485	--	--	35,985	--	--	33,485	--	--	-2,500	--
MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT.....	--	74,535	--	--	74,535	--	--	74,535	--	--	--	--
AIR BASE OPERABILITY.....	--	13,120	--	--	13,120	--	--	13,120	--	--	--	--
PALLET AIR CARGO.....	4,000	4,176	4,000	4,000	4,176	4,000	4,000	4,176	4,000	4,176	--	--
PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT.....	--	3,581	--	--	3,581	--	--	3,581	--	--	--	--
TACTICAL SHELTER.....	--	3,757	--	--	3,757	--	--	3,757	--	--	--	--
PRODUCTIVITY ENHANCEMENT	--	8,246	--	--	8,246	--	--	8,246	--	--	--	--
PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS.....	--	21,599	--	--	21,599	--	--	21,599	--	--	--	--
MOBILITY EQUIPMENT.....	--	546	--	--	546	--	--	546	--	--	--	--
NAVYTIME HOST NATION SUPPORT.....	--	3,293	--	--	3,293	--	--	3,293	--	--	--	--
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	--	745	--	--	745	--	--	745	--	--	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000.....	--	13,195	--	--	13,195	--	--	13,195	--	--	--	--
SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS												
INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION ACTIVITY.....	--	62,888	--	--	36,022	--	--	---	--	-62,888	-36,022	--
TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQ.....	--	2,918	--	--	2,918	--	--	2,918	--	--	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	House amount	
SELECTED ACTIVITIES.....	--	5,387,165	--	5,271,286	--	5,499,065	--	+111,900	--	--	+227,779	
SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM.....	--	162,051	--	162,051	--	162,051	--	--	--	--	--	
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS.....	--	3,871	--	3,871	--	3,871	--	--	--	--	--	
MISC EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
MODIFICATIONS.....	--	100	--	100	--	100	--	--	--	--	--	
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION.....	--	17,244	--	17,244	--	17,244	--	--	--	--	--	
TOTAL, OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP.....	--	5,938,628	--	5,798,383	--	5,987,640	--	+49,012	--	+189,257	--	
DROF ADJUSTMENT.....	--	--	--	65,200	--	--	--	--	--	--	-65,200	
CLASSIFIED PROGRAM.....	--	--	--	-350	--	--	--	--	--	--	+350	
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE.....	--	8,058,100	--	8,001,524	--	7,859,296	--	-198,804	--	-142,228	--	
TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE.....	--	8,058,100	--	8,001,524	--	7,958,619	--	-99,481	--	-42,905	--	

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

MUNITIONS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT

Skeet/sensor fuze weapon.—The Committee recommends funding the \$108,650,000 budget request for this item, but including report language directing the Secretary of Defense not to approve production of the sensor-fuzed weapon until the Air Force conclusively demonstrates that the weapon is cost effective and is needed. If production is delayed or not approved, the Air Force will not need all or part of the \$108,650,000 it requested for the weapon in fiscal year 1992 and the budget could be reduced by that amount.

MK-82 inert/BDU-50.—The Committee recommends an increase in funding of \$13,800,000 over the budget request to enhance readiness, improve training, maintain the industrial base, and increase war reserves.

ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT

Air traffic control/landing systems.—The Air Force budget request includes \$14,135,000 for the procurement of microwave landing systems in order to replace existing precision approach radars and instrument landing systems. The Air Force had planned in fiscal year 1991 to begin low-rate initial production for this system. However, due to slippage in the testing schedule, design flaws, and administrative contractor delays, low-rate initial production will not begin until fiscal year 1992. The Air Force proposes to execute the fiscal year 1992 full production rate procurement at the same time it executes the fiscal year 1991 program. Given the problems encountered with this program, it does not appear prudent to commence with the procurement of such a large number of systems until it has been demonstrated that all problems with the program have been successfully resolved. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$14,135,000 which will allow for the continuation of the planned low-rate initial production.

Weather observation/forecast.—The Air Force budget request includes \$59,524,000 for the procurement and installation of meteorological and space environmental equipment needed by the Air Force Air Weather Service. This request includes funds for the procurement of automated weather distribution systems to be installed at Air Force installations worldwide. Some of these systems will be installed at installations that are being considered for base closure or realignment of functions. It does not appear warranted to install this equipment at these facilities at this time. Therefore, the Committee recommends a reduction of \$1,115,000.

Defense support program [DSP].—The Air Force budget request includes \$52,066,000 for DSP which is a strategic surveillance and early warning satellite system. The Air Force has commenced a ground computer change-out program [GCO] in order to upgrade DSP ground stations. The Air Force was to purchase GCO computer hardware after a planned change in system software was operationally tested and demonstrated on existing software. However, the new software package is too large for the existing hardware and must be tested on GCO hardware. In consideration of this and the fact that there have been problems in the development of the

software, the Air Force should limit the GCO procurement to only that hardware necessary to conduct the operational test, which will not start until fiscal year 1993, and should defer the purchase of additional hardware until the operational test is complete and determined to be successful. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$18,000,000 against the procurement of computer hardware in advance of need.

Defense meteorological support program.—The Air Force budget request includes \$16,806,000 for tactical data receipt and processing terminals which are being upgraded to Mark IVB standards. Operational testing for the Mark IVB ground terminal has been delayed by approximately 1 year since submission of the budget to Congress. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$9,500,000 in the procurement of additional ground terminals until the operational test has been successfully completed.

Range improvements.—The Committee recommends an additional \$35,000,000 for the design, procurement, and installation of an instrumented air-to-ground training and bomb-scoring range for the Pacific Air Forces, to be located at an existing military operating area in Alaska. The loss of the sophisticated Crow Valley training range in the Philippines to the U.S. Pacific Air Forces significantly restricts training opportunities in the theater. The 11th Air Force currently utilizes extensive live fire training ranges in Alaska. These funds will permit the Pacific Air Forces to establish a new, modern electronic range facility that can integrate Air Force and Army aviation weapons training. The Committee expects the Secretary of the Air Force to report to the Committee the acquisition plan and installation schedule for this new range facility not later than March 15, 1992. Funds are provided in the fiscal year 1992 Military Construction appropriations bill for associated facilities to support this range modernization program.

Minimum essential emergency communications network.—The Air Force budget request includes \$17,546,000 for the procurement of 350 portable emergency action message processing and dissemination system terminals. The development, test, and evaluation completion schedule for this program has slipped by 1 year from July 1992 to July 1993. Therefore, the current proposed acquisition will not occur until late in fiscal year 1993 at the earliest. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$17,546,000.

Tactical communications and electronics equipment.—The Air Force budget request includes \$32,997,000 for the purchase of command, control, communications, and computer equipment to satisfy Air Force requirements. Within this program, the Air Force proposes to procure digital communication terminal [DCT] suites. The DCT suite normally consists of a DCT terminal and/or DCT gateway device, printer, and power supply unit. These equipments all require the same approximate lead-time to manufacture. Based on slippages to the fiscal year 1991 program and the variety of equipments being purchased, the procurement profile for the above equipment is no longer balanced. By deleting the planned fiscal year 1992 acquisition of printers and power supplies, remaining fiscal year 1991/1992 funding will allow for the equitable procurement of the various equipments necessary to field the DCT. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$3,435,000.

Radio equipment.—The Air Force has requested \$2,268,000 for the procurement of radio equipment in fiscal year 1992. The Committee recommends \$2,768,000 for these procurements in fiscal year 1992, an increase of \$500,000 above the budget request and the House allowance.

The Department of Defense has provided the Committee revised estimates for support of the START Treaty in fiscal year 1992. The details of these revised estimates are provided within the operation and maintenance section of this report.

Spares and repair parts.—The Air Force budget request includes \$162,457,000 for the purchase of spares and repair parts for the numerous communications and electronics systems that the Air Force supports. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$99,323,000 in fiscal year 1992 for an approved program of \$63,134,000. This recommendation is \$96,866,000 below the recommended House allowance.

Through adjustments in the "Missile procurement, Air Force" account, \$99,323,000 in fiscal year 1991 funds have been identified as excess to Air Force requirements and are recommended for transfer to this spares and repair parts program. As a result of this transfer, the Committee recommends an offsetting reduction to the fiscal year 1992 spares and repair parts program which should have no impact to this necessary logistics support effort.

Items less than \$2,000,000.—The Air Force has requested \$9,726,000 within the fiscal year 1992 request for various electronic equipment of a value less than \$2,000,000. The Committee recommends \$9,126,000 for these procurements, \$600,000 less than the budget request and the House allowance.

The Department of Defense has provided the Committee revised estimates for support of the START Treaty in fiscal year 1992. The details of these revised estimates are provided within the operation and maintenance section of this report.

Poor obligation rates/program execution performance.—The following programs are recommended for reduction due to poor program execution during fiscal year 1991:

Weather observation forecast.....	—\$19,500,000
Satellite control facility.....	—2,000,000
Constant watch.....	—2,800,000
Tactical communications/electronics equipment	—5,000,000
Total.....	—29,300,000

OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT

Air Force NBC readiness.—The Committee is extremely concerned by recent Government Accounting Office [GAO] allegations that United States troops were ill-equipped and ill-prepared to survive and fight in a chemical war with Iraq. Of particular concern is the future chemical warfare readiness of the Air Force, as forward air bases would be among the most likely targets of these area denial weapons.

The Committee, therefore, instructs the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct a study to determine means of improving the capability of tactical contingency forces to carry out their missions on battlefields contaminated by chemical weapons. In performing this

study, the Secretary should consider: (1) ways to make use of existing DOD facilities and equipment to improve the realism of Air Force chemical warfare training; (2) whether there are a sufficient number of chemical specialists in the tactical contingency forces of the Air Force to insure that individual members of the forces are physically and psychologically capable of carrying out their missions in a chemical environment; and (3) the feasibility and desirability of providing chemical warfare familiarization courses that make use of live chemical agents and chemical warfare equipment to such members who are not chemical warfare specialists.

The Committee notes that Lowry Air Force Base, where Air Force chemical specialists are currently trained, is scheduled for closure. To further improve the Air Force's state of NBC readiness, the Secretary should consider the benefits of colocating Air Force chemical training at the facility presently used jointly by the Army, Navy, and Marines. The Secretary should submit a report of his findings to the defense committees of Congress no later than June 1, 1992.

OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends incorporating the following adjustments to the budget estimate, in accordance with the Senate authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Armored sedan.....	329			- 329	
CAP vehicles.....		800	800	+ 800	
CAP commo.....		500	500	+ 500	
Telephone exchanges.....	60,641	59,841	52,241	- 8,400	- 7,600

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE AGENCIES

Appropriations, 1991	\$2,354,646,000
Budget estimate, 1992	2,089,600,000
House allowance	2,708,446,000
Committee recommendation.....	2,087,400,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,087,400,000, a reduction of \$2,200,000 to the amended budget estimate and \$621,046,000 below the House allowance.

This appropriation provides for procurement of capital equipment for the Defense Communications Agency, the Defense Investigative Service, the Defense Mapping Agency, the Defense Logistics Agency, and other agencies of the Department of Defense. The 1992 program includes procurement of automatic data processing equipment, mechanized material handling systems, general and special purpose vehicular equipment, communications equipments, and other items.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendations in comparison to the President's amended budget request and the House-passed bill:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget		House		Committee recommendation		Senate compared to--	
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Budget amount	House amount
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE AGENCIES								
MAJOR EQUIPMENT								
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD								
MOTOR VEHICLES.....	--	89,952	--	89,952	--	39,952	--	--
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/UNS.....	--	138,370	--	138,370	--	138,370	--	--
REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLES.....	--	94,700	--	94,700	--	94,700	--	--
CORPORATE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
JOINT SIMULATION OFFICE.....	--	--	--	--	--	30,000	+30,000	+30,000
MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAM.....	--	--	--	--	--	-87,400	-87,400	-87,400
ADP/CTM REDUCTION.....	--	--	--	65,000	--	--	--	-65,000
SUPERCOMPUTERS.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ELECTRONIC WARGAMING EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
COMMAND CONTROL COMMUNICATIONS & INTELLIGENCE.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
DRUG INTERDICTION.....	--	40,000	--	40,000	--	--	--	-40,000
ELECTRONIC WARFARE.....	--	89,400	3	89,400	3	93,000	+3	+3,600
C-20F AIRCRAFT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA								
CLASSIFIED EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	-18,000	-18,000	-18,000
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHA								
VEHICLES.....	--	914	--	914	--	914	--	--
OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT.....	--	3,615	--	3,615	--	3,615	--	--
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCA								
WARPCS ADP SYSTEMS.....	--	11,093	--	11,093	--	11,093	--	--
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MILLION.....	--	27,009	--	27,009	--	27,009	--	--
PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT FUNDING.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
DEF BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND.....	--	13,502	--	13,502	--	13,502	--	--
INDUSTRIAL/DEPOT MAINTENANCE EQUIP.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA								
INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS.....	--	--	--	--	--	69,700	+69,700	+69,700
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA								
MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
VEHICLES.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MECHANIZED MATERIALS HANDLING SYS.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ADP EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

[[In thousands of dollars]]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	32,500	--	--	--	--	--	--	-32,500
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MILLION.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
INDUSTRIAL/DEPOT MAINTENANCE.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DNA												
ADP EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OFFSET PRESS.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
VEHICLES.....	--	456	--	--	456	--	--	456	--	--	--	--
OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT.....	--	20,317	--	--	20,317	--	--	20,317	--	--	--	--
GEODESY AND GEOPHYSICAL EQUIPMENT.....	--	300	--	--	300	--	--	300	--	--	--	--
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIS												
VEHICLES.....	--	2,115	--	--	2,115	--	--	2,115	--	--	--	--
OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT.....	--	3,203	--	--	3,203	--	--	3,203	--	--	--	--
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, USUHS												
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MILLION.....	--	825	--	--	825	--	--	825	--	--	--	--
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA												
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MILLION.....	--	3,586	--	--	3,586	--	--	3,586	--	--	--	--
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO												
MAJOR EQUIPMENT.....	--	239,240	--	--	239,240	--	--	179,240	--	-60,000	--	-60,000
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OJCS												
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OJCS.....	--	21,686	--	--	21,686	--	--	21,686	--	--	--	--
ON-SITE INSPECTION AGENCY												
VEHICLES.....	--	20	--	--	20	--	--	50	--	+30	--	+30
OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT.....	--	7,501	--	--	7,501	--	--	8,471	--	+970	--	+970
STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE ORGANIZATION												
PATRIOT.....	--	25,000	--	--	25,000	--	--	25,000	--	--	--	--
ERINT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TNAAD.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL, MAJOR EQUIPMENT.....		703,404			930,304			691,704		-11,700		-238,600

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Budget amount	Qty.	House amount
SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND												
AVIATION PROGRAMS												
MC-130H COMBAT TALON II.....	--	112,993	--	--	112,993	--	--	112,993	--	--	--	--
C-130 MODIFICATIONS.....	--	101,663	--	--	101,663	--	--	101,663	--	--	--	-55,500
NH-47/NH-60 MODIFICATIONS.....	--	311,577	--	--	311,577	--	--	311,577	--	--	--	--
NH-60 MODIFICATIONS.....	--	19,618	--	--	19,618	--	--	19,618	--	--	--	--
HH-53 MODIFICATIONS.....	--	24,791	--	--	24,791	--	--	24,791	--	--	--	+9,700
OTHER AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS.....	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--	
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT.....	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--	
SHIPBUILDING												
PATROL BOAT, COASTAL.....	--	2,605	--	--	2,605	--	--	2,605	--	--	--	-38,600
MC VIII MOD 1 - SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE.....	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--	
SUBMARINE CONVERSION.....	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--	
AMMUNITION PROGRAMS												
SOF INDIV WEAPONS AMMUNITION.....	--	13,083	--	--	13,083	--	--	13,083	--	--	--	--
SOF PYRO/DENO.....	--	20,780	--	--	20,780	--	--	20,780	--	--	--	--
SOF PLATFORM GUN AMMUNITION.....	--	39,252	--	--	39,252	--	--	39,252	--	--	--	--
AC-130 GUNSHIP AMMUNITION.....	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--	--
ROCKET, HYDRA.....	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--	--
RANGER ANTI-ARMOR WPN SYS AMMUNITION.....	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--	--
SMALL ARMS AND LANDING PARTY AMMUNITION.....	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--	--
PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION.....	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--	--
OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS												
COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS.....	--	77,816	--	--	77,816	--	--	77,816	--	--	--	--
SOF SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS.....	--	5,682	--	--	5,682	--	--	5,682	--	--	--	+4,722
SPECIAL WARFARE EQUIPMENT.....	--	23,608	--	--	23,608	--	--	23,608	--	--	--	-1,200
COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS.....	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--	+37,794
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT.....	--	40,999	--	--	51,699	--	--	50,699	--	+9,500	--	--
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	--	124,264	--	--	86,470	--	--	124,264	--	--	--	--
PSYOP EQUIPMENT.....	--	1,500	--	--	1,500	--	--	1,500	--	--	--	--
SWIMMER WEAPONS SYSTEM.....	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--	--
RANGER WEAPONS.....	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--	--
RANGER VEHICLES.....	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--	--
NAVY SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS.....	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	--	--
TOTAL, SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND.....		920,231			972,815			929,731		+9,500		-43,084

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget			House			Committee recommendation			Senate compared to--		
	Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Amount		Qty.	Budget amount	House amount
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	--			--			--			--		
DBOF ADJUSTMENT.....	--	465,965		--	541,727		--	465,965		--		-75,762
MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAM.....	--	--		--	230,400		--	--		--		-230,400
DBOF TECHNICAL CORRECTION.....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--		--
JOINT SIMULATION OFFICE PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS.....	--	--		--	--		--	--		--		--
DFAS (Def. Finance and Acctg Service).....	--	--		--	33,200		--	--		--		--
												-33,200
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE AGENCIES.....		2,089,600			2,708,446			2,087,400			-2,200	-621,046

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Major equipment, OSD/WHS.—The amended 1992 budget request includes \$89,952,000 for the procurement of mission essential new and replacement equipment for the Office of the Secretary of Defense [OSD] and the Washington headquarters services. The Committee recommends full funding for this activity in fiscal year 1992, however, only provides \$39,952,000 in new budget authority. The Department is directed to use \$50,000,000 of fiscal year 1991 funds provided to the Joint Simulation Office which now have been identified as excess to requirements to fully fund fiscal year 1992 OSD/WHS funding requirements.

Joint simulation office.—Last year Congress directed the establishment of a Department of Defense-wide office to coordinate a total defense approach to simulation and training devices for both acquisition programs and training. Congress provided \$60,000,000 in procurement and \$15,000,000 in research and development funding for this purpose in fiscal year 1991. The Department requested no additional procurement or research and development funding within the amended fiscal year 1992 budget for this activity.

The Committee is pleased that the Department moved promptly to establish the Executive Council for Modeling and Simulation [Excims] and a Defense Modeling and Simulation Office [DMSO] to serve as the focal point for all Department of Defense modeling and simulation policy.

The DMSO is in the process of developing a master plan for modeling and simulation for the Department for the future, to include a long-range joint investment strategy for modeling and simulation. The Committee understands that the DMSO has adopted a philosophy of surveying the analytic, academic, Government, and contractor communities to determine what strategy should be adopted in selected areas. The Committee believes this is a necessary and appropriate role for the DMSO.

The Committee is concerned, however, that the DMSO not adopt an agenda that goes substantially beyond this coordination and policy development role. The Committee believes that program management and prototyping should reside with the services and Defense agencies, and not with a DMSO which has been chartered for policy development and coordination responsibilities. The Committee has recommended modest funds for procurement, but understands that these funds are to be used solely to procure items of equipment that are required to implement the policy and coordination functions and to conduct limited demonstration projects. The Committee cautions the DMSO to adhere to the intent of the Congress which is to develop policy through an ongoing master plan process, to identify a long-range investment strategy for modeling and simulation, to evaluate the services' investment plans and recommend adjustments to the Secretary based on the master plan, and to identify to the Secretary areas that need attention in the services' plans and programs.

The implementation directives for this new activity were just recently signed and the Committee notes that a majority of the pro-

curement funding provided in fiscal year 1991 has not yet been obligated and will not be needed until fiscal year 1992. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the \$50,000,000 in fiscal year 1991 procurement funds be made available to fund the fiscal year 1992 OSD/WHS major equipment procurements.

The Committee has been recently informed of the DMSO's funding requirements for fiscal year 1992. Rather than use prior year funds with 1 less year of availability, the Committee recommends \$10,000,000 in procurement and \$40,000,000 in research and development funds for fiscal year 1992 to support DMSO's activities.

C-20F aircraft.—The Committee recommends providing \$93,000,000 for the procurement of three C-20F aircraft in fiscal year 1992. As directed by the Senate authorization bill, these aircraft are to be operated in the U.S. Pacific Command area, to include Alaska, in support of the commander in chief of the U.S. Pacific Command [CINCPAC] and all the service components in his region.

Mentor-Protege Program.—The participation of small business concerns, and especially small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, in contracting opportunities funded under the Department of Defense appropriations act continues to be a matter of importance to the Committee. The Committee has sponsored or lent its support to various initiatives to expand the participation in DOD prime contract and subcontract opportunities for such small business concerns, and other historically underutilized sources such as business enterprise ventures sponsored by various Indian tribes and workshops that provide employment to the severely handicapped.

The Committee expresses its strong support for Pilot Mentor-Protege Program, which was authorized by the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1991 and becomes effective on October 1, 1991. This business-to-business developmental assistance program holds great potential for developing additional fully qualified suppliers from among the ranks of underutilized small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.

The Committee has included Sec. 8064 regarding eligibility of certain business enterprises to be proteges under the Pilot Mentor-Protege Program. The provision makes explicit the eligibility of business enterprises owned by an Indian tribe, an Alaska native corporation, or a native Hawaiian organization. It also provides eligibility for business entities having within their work force specified percentages of severely disabled individuals who have been integrated into the organization's overall work force through the use of rehabilitative engineering. The Committee urges prospective mentor firms to make every reasonable effort to enter into mentor-protege agreements with such qualified organizations employing the severely disabled, if mutually beneficial, long-term business relationships are likely to result from such a mentoring arrangement. Similarly, the Department should make every reasonable effort to support, financially and otherwise, prospective mentor-protege arrangements involving such entities.

The Committee has appropriated \$30,000,000 solely for the purpose of providing funding to initiate the reimbursement of costs in-

curred by mentor firms in providing developmental assistance under the Mentor-Protégé Program. In this regard, the Committee notes that the Department will need to implement the authority provided by the enabling statute to enter into separate cost reimbursement agreements between a mentor and the Department.

Given the potential for very broad participation from the prospective mentor community, with some mentors likely to have multiple protégés, the Committee recognizes that additional program funding is likely to be necessary. In this regard, the Committee urges two actions on the part of the Department. First, the Committee, like the authorizing committee, would invite reprogramming requests from the Department during fiscal year 1992 to nurture a vigorous implementation of the Mentor-Protégé Program during its initial year of operation.

Second, the Committee strongly urges program managers, especially on the Department's major programs, to fund mentor-protégé arrangements proposed by their prime contractors during fiscal year 1992. Such support will further contribute to the Committee's goal of fostering strong implementation of the Mentor-Protégé Program during its first year. Developmental assistance costs incurred under such program-funded mentoring arrangements, if successful, will be given favorable attention in the Committee's consideration of the program's funding request for fiscal year 1993.

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Red River Army Depot consolidation.—The Defense Logistics Agency [DLA] has requested no procurement funding for equipment for Red River Army Depot consolidation within their fiscal year 1992 amended budget request. The House has provided \$32,500,000 for procurement of major equipment in fiscal year 1992, while rescinding prior year funding for the Army in the same amount. The Committee is supportive of what the House is seeking to do, but believes the House's action is premature.

The Committee strongly supports DLA's consolidation initiative, particularly with respect to Red River, and believes equipment for Red River should be fully funded in the year it is needed. The Committee notes that, under current DLA plans, such equipment is not needed in fiscal year 1992. The Committee expects DLA to request full funding for equipment for the Red River consolidation as soon as it is needed, which could be as soon as fiscal year 1993.

ON-SITE INSPECTION AGENCY

Vehicles.—The On-Site Inspection Agency has requested \$20,000 for the procurement of two vehicles in fiscal year 1992. The Committee recommends \$50,000 for the procurement of two vehicles in fiscal year 1992, an increase of \$30,000 over the budget request and the House allowance.

The Committee notes an administrative error on the part of the Department which incorrectly provided a computer listing of the budget request as \$20,000 for the procurement of two vehicles. The On-Site Inspection Agency's backup justification material shows a more realistic figure of \$50,000 for the procurement of two vehicles. The Committee has increased the request by \$30,000, taking this

additional amount out of the funds provided for other capital equipment.

Other capital equipment.—The On-Site Inspection Agency has requested \$7,501,000 for the procurement of various capital equipment in fiscal year 1992. The Committee recommends \$8,471,000 for these procurements, an increase of \$970,000 over the budget request and the House allowance.

The Department of Defense has provided the Committee revised estimates for support of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty [START], Intermediate Nuclear Forces [INF], Conventional Forces Europe [CFE], chemical weapons [CW], and Nuclear Testing Treaty [NTT] in fiscal year 1992. The details of these revised estimates are provided within the operation and maintenance section of this report.

The Committee also recommends \$23,100,000 of excess fiscal year 1991 funds, based upon the revised estimates provided by the Department, be used toward the remaining unfunded fiscal year 1992 requirement.

OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends the following other adjustments. Adjustments to classified programs are discussed in the classified annex to this report.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1991	\$2,463,700,000
Budget estimate, 1992	
House allowance	1,292,500,000
Committee recommendation	667,300,000

The Committee recommends a funding level of \$667,300,000 for National Guard and Reserve dedicated equipment. This recommendation is \$667,300,000 above the budget request and \$625,200,000 below the House allowance.

The Committee requests that the Chief of each National Guard and Reserve component receiving such funds for unit equipment shall allocate them to provide units with the most military capability for the money, based upon the readiness requirements of their respective units. In addition, a report is to be provided to the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services on the items of equipment to be procured with such funds within 120 days after the date of enactment of this act.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following tables detail the Committee recommendations in comparison to the President's amended budget request and the House-passed bill:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget		House		Committee recommendation		Senate compared to--	
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Budget amount	House amount
NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT								
RESERVE EQUIPMENT								
ARMY RESERVE								
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	25,000	--	10,000	--	-15,000
COMMUNICATIONS ELECTRONICS.....	--	--	--	15,000	--	--	--	-15,000
SHOP EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TEST SET COMMON CORE.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
DRUG INTERDICTION.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SINGARS RADIOS.....	--	--	--	15,000	--	--	--	-15,000
NIGHT VISION.....	--	--	--	15,000	--	--	--	-15,000
TACTICAL TRUCKS.....	--	--	--	20,000	--	--	--	-20,000
C-12F.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL.....	--	--	--	90,000	--	10,000	+10,000	-80,000
NAVY RESERVE								
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	23,500	--	10,000	--	-13,500
AN-8011 TRAINERS.....	--	--	--	10,000	--	--	--	-10,000
C-130T AIRCRAFT.....	--	--	2	57,000	--	--	-2	-57,000
C-20 AIRCRAFT.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MH-60H UPGRADE KITS.....	--	--	--	45,000	--	--	--	-45,000
AN-AQA-7B IPADS.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MH-53 HELICOPTERS.....	--	--	--	--	4	129,000	+4	+129,000
LAMPS MK-1 ASW UPGRADE.....	--	--	--	35,000	--	--	--	-35,000
P-3C AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	20,000	--	--	--	-20,000
P-3 UPGRADES.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
DRUG INTERDICTION.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL.....	--	--	--	190,500	--	139,000	+139,000	-51,500
MARINE CORPS RESERVE								
COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	15,000	--	--	--	-15,000
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT.....	--	--	--	15,000	--	7,500	+7,500	-7,500
KC-130T AIRCRAFT.....	--	--	2	67,000	--	--	-2	-67,000
AH-1V COBRA AIRCRAFT.....	--	--	6	71,000	--	--	-6	-71,000
DRUG INTERDICTION.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL.....	--	--	--	168,000	--	7,500	+7,500	-160,500

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget		House		Committee recommendation		Senate compared to--	
	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Qty.	Amount	Budget amount	House amount
AIR FORCE RESERVE								
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	--	--	--	25,000	--	7,500	+7,500	-17,500
C-130 AIRCRAFT	--	--	8	200,000	--	--	--	-200,000
F-16 MODIFICATIONS	--	--	--	20,000	--	--	--	--
C-130 MODIFICATIONS	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
DRUG INTERDICTION	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL				245,000		7,500	+7,500	-237,500
NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT								
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD								
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	--	--	--	25,000	--	15,000	+15,000	-10,000
OH-580 HELICOPTERS	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
AH-1 MOOS	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
UH-60 HELICOPTERS	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MEDIUM TACTICAL TRUCKS	--	--	--	20,000	--	--	--	-20,000
MEDIUM TACTICAL TRUCKS - PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TACTICAL TRUCKS	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TRUCK, TRACTOR, HP16	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-62,000
BATTERY COMPUTER SYSTEM	--	--	10	62,000	--	--	--	--
C-23 AIRCRAFT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
FAMILY OF HEAVY VEHICLES	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
FAMILY OF M13 VEHICLES	--	--	6	21,000	2	6,000	+2	-15,000
C-26 AIRCRAFT	--	--	--	--	--	110,000	+110,000	+110,000
HLRS LAUNCHERS	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
HLRS BN SPT EQUIPMENT	--	--	--	15,000	--	--	--	-15,000
NIGHT VISION DEVICES	--	--	--	15,000	--	--	--	-15,000
COMMUNICATIONS ELECTRONICS	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SQUAD ENGAGEMENT TRAINING DEVICES	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
RESERVE STAFF SIMULATION CENTER	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
DRUG INTERDICTION	--	--	--	35,000	--	--	--	-35,000
SINGCAR'S RADIOS	--	--	--	193,000	--	131,000	+131,000	-62,000
TOTAL				500,000		337,300	+337,300	-25,000
AIR NATIONAL GUARD								
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	--	--	2	25,000	--	--	--	-25,000
C-130 AIRCRAFT	--	--	--	50,000	13	337,300	+337,300	+287,300
C-130 MODIFICATIONS	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

ARMY RESERVE

Miscellaneous equipment.—The Committee recommends \$10,000,000 for the procurement of unspecified miscellaneous equipment purchases to improve the readiness ratings of Army Reserve units.

C-12F.—The Committee recommends \$9,300,000 to purchase three C-12F aircraft for the Army Reserve. The number of aircraft is the same as assumed in the Senate-passed authorization bill.

NAVY RESERVE

Miscellaneous equipment.—The Committee recommends \$10,000,000 for the procurement of unspecified miscellaneous equipment purchases to improve the readiness ratings of Naval Reserve units.

MH-53 helicopters.—The Committee provides funds to procure four MH-53 mine sweeping helicopters for the Navy Reserve. This is the same as recommended by the House and assumed in the Senate-passed authorization bill.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE

Miscellaneous equipment.—The Committee recommends \$7,500,000 for the procurement of unspecified miscellaneous equipment purchases to improve the readiness ratings of Marine Corps units. The Committee has annually provided funds to meet emergent requirements for the Marine Corps Reserve, and to procure specialized equipment for unique missions. The Committee recognizes the performance of the Marine Corps Reserve during Operations Desert Shield/Storm, and understands that specific equipment shortfalls were identified in Marine Reserve reconnaissance units. The Committee directs that not less than \$7,500,000 will be employed to upgrade communications, night vision, and other specialized equipment needs for Marine Corps Reserve reconnaissance units.

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Miscellaneous equipment.—The Committee recommends \$7,500,000 for the procurement of unspecified miscellaneous equipment purchases to improve the readiness ratings of Air Force Reserve units.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

Miscellaneous equipment.—The Committee recommends \$15,000,000 for the procurement of unspecified miscellaneous equipment purchases to improve the readiness ratings of Army National Guard units.

Army Guard transport aircraft.—The Committee understands the Army National Guard has identified a requirement for short take-off landing [STOL] aircraft to replace aging Twin Otter's aircraft in the Army Guard. The Committee supports this initiative, and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau should review the operational

requirements and characteristics for a replacement program, survey available aircraft that could meet this mission, and report results of this review to the Committee not later than March 15, 1992. The Committee expects the review to include an acquisition plan for the procurement, maintenance, and logistical support for candidate aircraft for this mission. The Committee will support funding for the replacement program in fiscal year 1993, based on the results of this review and acquisition plan.

C-26 aircraft.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,000,000 for the procurement of two C-26 aircraft for the Army National Guard. This is \$15,000,000 below the House allowance.

MLRS launchers.—The Committee recommends an additional \$110,000,000 for the accelerated procurement of MLRS launchers for the Army National Guard. It is the expectation of the Committee that these launchers will be deployed by the 1/623 Field Artillery Battalion, a unit which fought with distinction in Operation Desert Storm.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

C-130 aircraft.—The Committee recommends \$337,300,000 for the purchase of 13 C-130 aircraft. Twelve of these aircraft are for the Wyoming Air National Guard and one is for North Dakota.

MH-60 helicopters.—The Committee recommends \$35,000,000 for the purchase of four MH-60 helicopters for the Hawaii Air National Guard. These helicopters will be part of an air sea rescue squadron to be established in Hawaii.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

Appropriations, 1991	\$50,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	
House allowance	25,000,000
Committee recommendation	

The Committee recommends no funding for the fiscal year 1992 Defense Production Act purchases programs. This recommendation is \$25,000,000 below the amount provided by the House allowance.

These funds would provide for the purchase, or commitments to purchase, critical defense metals, minerals, or other materials with the express purpose of creating a domestic source or increasing the current U.S. industrial capacity.

PROCUREMENT OF SEALIFT AND PREPOSITIONING EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE

Appropriations, 1991	
Budget estimate, 1992	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	\$2,000,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,000,000,000, an increase of \$2,000,000,000 above the budget request and the House allowance.

This appropriation provides funds for the construction and conversion of ships, purchase of missiles, tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, other weapons, communications, and other procurement for the Department of Defense for sealift and prepositioning programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The Committee recommendation provides \$2,000,000,000 for a new appropriation to address the current shortfalls in prepositioning assets and sealift in the Department of Defense. Desert Storm demonstrated that current shortfalls continue to plague our Nation's ability to respond rapidly by sea. It also dramatized the responsiveness of prepositioned material, particularly sea-based, for crisis response.

The Committee has spoken often in the past several years on the need for the Defense Department to redress its sealift shortfall. The amount requested herein should help alleviate the shortages. In addition, the Committee recognizes that improved sealift capability should be accompanied by increased resources devoted to prepositioning material. The Senate-passed authorization provides substantial increases for sealift and Marine Corps prepositioning. The Committee recommendation reflects the spirit of this authorization. The House has recommended \$2,295,000,000 for these purposes in other accounts. The Committee has chosen to put these two related programs together. This will allow the Defense Department the greatest flexibility in responding to the related requirements.

The Committee directs the Office of the Secretary of Defense to evaluate the priorities for the elements of this program and report to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services prior to obligating funds under this appropriation.

Build and charter.—The Committee believes the Defense Department should examine the prospects for entering into a build and charter arrangement or similar program to redress partially its sealift shortfalls. The Committee recognizes that a large portion of the commercial car carrier fleet will reach obsolescence in the next few years. In light of this situation, there may be an opportunity for the Navy to enter into a CRAF like program for sealift, whereby operators of modified car carriers would contract with U.S. shipyards to construct new ships, and the Navy would contract for defense-related modifications and operations in times of crisis. This initiative should include consideration of build and charter relationships with private, State, and local entities that operate ocean-going vehicle and passenger carrying vessels that could respond to defense transportation missions. The Committee expects the Navy to consider this approach in response to the funding provided herein for sealift.

TITLE IV RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The fiscal year 1992 Department of Defense budget request for research, development, test, and evaluation totaled \$40,073,133,000. The accompanying Senate bill contains \$37,693,684,000 a reduction of \$2,379,449,000, or about 5.9 percent from the budget estimate. The recommended allowance is \$1,718,892,000 below the fiscal year 1991 appropriation for RDT&E. The following table summarizes the budget estimates and Committee recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Change from budget
RDT&E Army.....	6,307,300	6,280,361	-26,939
RDT&E Navy ¹	8,194,233	7,666,142	-528,091
RDT&E Air Force.....	15,032,600	14,123,675	-908,925
RDT&E defense agencies.....	10,238,500	9,393,542	-844,958
Director of Test and Evaluation.....	286,300	215,764	-70,536
Director of Operational Test and Evaluation.....	14,200	14,200	
Total, title IV, RDT&E.....	40,073,133	37,693,684	-2,379,449

¹ The Navy request and the Committee recommendation do not include the proposed budget amendment correction which provides reduction of \$851,600,000.

COMMITTEE OVERVIEW

The following considerations are the context for the Committee's review of the fiscal year 1992 budget request for Defense RDT&E.

First, the fiscal years 1992-97 future years defense program is seriously underfunded in research, development, test, and evaluation. The fiscal year 1992 request represents unaffordable commitments that cannot be kept in the future budget environment. The Committee refuses to exacerbate this problem by approving many requested new start programs or major program increases which lack absolute military justification.

Second, modest initiatives are recommended to enhance critical defense technologies, address critical war fighting deficiencies, or accelerate high-priority systems development. However, since resources are limited, the Committee believes open-ended, costly commitments in these areas also are not supportable.

Third, programs lacking solid program plans and specific justification are denied, deferred, or maintained at the fiscal year 1991 funding level. Several requested new starts have been deleted as unjustified or premature.

The Defense Department [DOD] infrastructure can be expected to continue to contract along with the contraction in the rest of the national defense establishment. The Committee has been cautious about investing significant funds in facilities which may be realigned or have very different roles in the future DOD RDT&E infrastructure.

MAJOR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Reflecting this approach, the Committee's major recommendations, by Defense Department component, are:

Army.—(1) Adding \$25,000,000 for the development of joint surveillance/target attack radar system [JSTARS] ground station modules; (2) denying \$500,000 requested for a new start light satellite project in the command, control, and communications technology effort; (3) decreasing by \$41,800,000 the armored systems modernization program and directing the Army to reassess its priority for this effort; (4) canceling the Stingray Program by denying \$20,200,000 within the electronic warfare development activity; (5) deleting \$8,000,000 of the \$507,754,000 budget request for the light armed scout helicopter to defer the longbow integration project; (6) reducing the Army Kwajalein Atoll Program element by \$500,000 while identifying funds to complete an environmental impact statement for the Strategic Targeting System [STARS] Program; (7) deleting \$13,711,000 requested for the Army Technical Test Instrumentation and Targets Program; (8) denying \$10,400,000 requested within the Army user test instrumentation and threat simulators for the mobile Army instrumentation system [MAIS] and requiring the system to use a common DOD simulation standard; (9) adding \$63,000,000 for development of the advanced field artillery system and uncharge artillery projectile propellant; and (10) allowing the Army to use \$25,000,000 in prior year funds to reinstate development of a fiber-optic guided antitank missile.

Navy/Marine Corps.—(1) Providing \$20,000,000 to develop an antisubmarine warfare [ASW] standoff weapon while terminating the vertical launch ASROC; (2) eliminating \$12,665,000 for new start efforts on gun weapon system advanced technology and an air-launched saturation system; (3) deleting \$67,724,000 within several program elements for the enhanced modular signal processor [EMSP], in response to the uncertain cost of EMSP and the declining inventory requirements; (4) accelerating development of a near-term, airborne countermine system, known as magic lantern, by adding \$14,000,000 to the budget request while deleting \$16,828,000 from the Marine Corps advanced technology demonstrations program element for a more costly, far-term effort; (5) deleting \$43,300,000 for premature enhancements to the new Trident II missile; (6) denies \$21,000,000 to terminate the tactical surveillance sonobuoy [TSS] project; (7) maintains the Navy's NAASW program at the fiscal year 1991 funding level by providing \$13,800,000; (8) funding the Navy's electric drive program at the fiscal year 1991 level of \$53,799,000; (9) deleting \$37,700,000 requested to develop the closed cycle ADCAP propulsion system for the MK-48 advanced capability heavy torpedo; (10) directing the Navy to prepare a plan for modernization of the P-3 maritime patrol aircraft while

funding the program at the \$51,044,000 level; (11) denying \$32,143,000 of the funds requested for electronic warfare [EW] development; (12) deleting all funds for the advanced bomb family; (13) denying \$58,700,000 for the AN/SQY-1 surface ship Antisubmarine Warfare Program; (14) deleting \$133,000,000 for F/A-18E/F program while directing that updated cost estimates and an independent assessments be performed; (15) providing \$34,712,000 for development of the supersonic low-altitude target; (16) providing \$50,000,000 for concept designs, technology development, and supporting assessments to accelerate efforts on the Centurion new design nuclear attack submarine; (17) adding \$50,000,000 to begin upgrades for the Marine CH-46E medium lift helicopter; (18) approving \$35,000,000 to enhance near-term ship anti-air warfare defenses; and (19) adding \$20,500,000 to expand mine countermeasures activities.

Air Force.—(1) Deleting \$34,964,000 within several program elements for Air Force space-based wide area surveillance efforts; (2) providing \$347,647,000 for small intercontinental ballistic missile [ICBM] development; (3) denying \$231,833,000 requested for the national aerospace plane [NASP]; (4) providing \$133,000,000 to improve the computers and communications systems linking the North American Aerospace Command Headquarters at Cheyenne Mountain, CO, with the Strategic Air Command, Omaha, NE, and the National Command Authority in Washington, DC; (5) adding \$15,000,000 to the budget request to develop a reconnaissance version of the F-117; (6) deleting \$34,346,000 to develop the short-range attack missile—tactical [SRAM-T]; (7) decreasing by \$17,250,000 the request for electronic warfare [EW] development; (8) increasing the budget request for the joint surveillance/target attack radar system [JSTARS] by \$5,000,000; (9) approving \$119,795,000 for F-15E squadrons and \$159,978,000 for F-16 squadrons; (10) deferring the AIM-9X program by deleting \$12,800,000 from the request; (11) decreasing by \$97,744,000 funding for the advanced launch system; (12) deleting \$61,150,000 for range improvement; (13) adding \$50,000,000 to enhance efforts to upgrade the Titan IV heavy-lift space booster; (14) approving \$1,563,072,000 to fully fund RDT&E for the B-2 advanced technology bomber; (15) allocating \$1,637,182,000 for full-scale development of the advanced tactical fighter; and (16) providing \$377,359,000 to develop the C-17 advanced transport aircraft.

Defense agencies.—(1) Providing \$4,600,000,000, for strategic defense initiative and theater missile defense initiative programs; (2) deleting \$150,999,000 from the Defense Nuclear Agency request and directing that \$105,046,000 of the deleted projects be funded by SDIO; (3) adding the following funds to enhance manufacturing capabilities: (a) \$25,000,000 for manufacturing engineering education, (b) \$5,000,000 for managers in the classroom, (c) \$10,000,000 for the United States-Japan management training program; (4) adding \$10,000,000 to the university research initiatives program to continue the DOD experimental program to stimulate competitive research [EPSCoR]; (5) adding \$20,000,000 to the budget request of \$268,300,000 for strategic technology research by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA]; (6) eliminating \$100,000,000 for unspecified concept evaluations; (7) providing

\$120,900,000, for tactical technology research; (8) adding \$31,000,000 to the materials and electronics technology program to fund efforts to develop technology and manufacturing processes for continuous fiber metal matrix composites materials and diamond substrate materials; (9) increasing the budget request by \$75,000,000 to continue the precompetitive technology development program; (10) adding \$9,740,000 to the joint DOD-DOE munitions technology development program to fund the effort at the \$20,000,000 level; (11) reducing funding for experimental evaluation of major innovative technologies by \$11,740,000; (12) providing \$154,968,000 for the balanced technology initiative; (13) deferring \$11,250,000 requested for chemical weapons verification within the verification technology demonstration program; (14) deleting \$109,000,000 requested for the air defense initiative; (15) adding \$30,000,000 to the budget request for OSD support of nonacoustic antisubmarine warfare [NAASW] efforts; (16) denying the \$20,000,000 requested for the joint standoff weapons [JSOW] program; (17) increasing funds for the joint remotely piloted vehicles [RPV] program; (18) recommending a reduction of \$21,614,000 to the budget request for special operations tactical systems development; (19) approving \$157,000,000 for manufacturing technology within the DOD; (20) reducing the funds requested for NATO research and development by \$21,700,000; (21) adding \$27,000,000 for efforts to integrate computer systems with manufacturing processes; (22) including bill language to require obligation of \$5,000,000 in fiscal year 1991 funds for the Critical Technologies Institute; (23) providing reduced funding of \$89,927,000 for the Central Test and Evaluation Investment Program [CTEIP].

PRINCIPAL COMMITTEE OBSERVATIONS

FISCAL YEARS 1992-97 RDT&E BUDGET UNDERFUNDING

The Committee is deeply concerned that, based on the fiscal year 1992 budget request and other Defense Department information, the entire future years defense program is seriously underfunded and likely to be unaffordable due to future severe budget constraints.

The Department has recognized this. However, the Committee concludes it has failed to take adequate action to solve this problem. On June 3, 1991, the Acting Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition warned the Pentagon's Comptroller about the magnitude of the underfunding problem. He said that underfunded programs would no longer be permitted to proceed beyond their next major milestone reviews by the Defense Acquisition Board unless the particular funding problem is solved.

Nevertheless, some programs will not reach new milestone reviews for several years. Thus, hundreds of millions could be expended digging the Pentagon into a deeper fiscal hole, before there is an opportunity to enforce budgetary discipline.

The Committee believes the Defense Department has been unable to make priority choices among competing programs and is seeking to continue or expand programs for which many billions of funds have not been budgeted in the future. These programs range from high priority modernization efforts like the Army light armed

scout helicopter, Navy AX aircraft, and Air Force advanced tactical fighter, to smaller RDT&E activities.

In the Committee's opinion, this situation is militarily and fiscally unwise, and unfair to the taxpayers, the armed services, and the defense industry. Commitments made today will not be affordable in the future, forcing program reductions or terminations which waste resources, deny the military desired weapons, and disrupt the industrial base.

The Committee is extremely reluctant to worsen this unsatisfactory fiscal and military condition by continuing or increasing certain programs as requested by the Defense Department. Instead, to encourage the Defense Department to make priority choices, the Committee recommends either terminating, or restraining at the fiscal year 1991 funding level, programs which can be characterized as: (1) those which are lower in priority than other, more militarily important programs which also are underfunded; (2) those for which changes in the threat reduce or eliminate their military urgency or justification; (3) those which are unaffordable under future budget limits; and (4) those for which less costly alternatives can be pursued to meet essential military requirements.

NEW START RDT&E PROGRAMS

The Committee recommends deferring or reducing several new start programs in each of the services. These actions are proposed in view of the fiscal concerns mentioned above and when the proposed new start is: (1) a low priority; (2) lacks firm program plans or military requirements, is poorly defined, or is of questionable technical nature; (3) is premature or yields a result so far in the future as to remove any urgency to begin it now; (4) responds to an uncertain threat; or (5) is underfunded in the future years defense program. The impacted projects are listed and explained in the separate report sections.

The projects—listed by program element, title, and dollar amount—are:

[In thousands of dollars]

Army:	
C ³ Technology/lightweight tactical area communications.....	500
Light armed scout helicopter/longbow LH.....	8,000
Electronic warfare development/optical countermeasures	2,000
Navy:	
Helicopter development/medium-lift replacement	51,500
Gun weapon system advanced technology	5,134
Air-launched saturation system.....	7,531
Tomahawk/block IV	1,200
Electronic warfare development/several projects	25,343
Air Force:	
Electronic technology/agile laser/adv. IR source, LAREWS	3,153
Defense agencies:	
Experimental evaluation of major innovative technologies [EEMIT]/adv. space tech program/EHF communications concepts/tech	3,000
EEMIT/close combat/new smart mine	2,000
Tactical tech/close combat tech/Zeal Dawn follow-on	12,000

FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTERS [FFRDC'S]

The Committee continues its initiative begun last year to constrain the exorbitant growth in funds for 10 federally funded defense research and development centers.

The Committee objects strongly to Defense Department actions which overturned the funding reductions mandated for fiscal years 1991-92 in the conference report and conference-endorsed Senate report on the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1991. In several instances, the Office of the Secretary of Defense [OSD] and the individual military services exceeded the approved funding levels for the current fiscal year without prior Committee approval.

The Department also ignored the conference report direction requiring that the fiscal year 1992 budget request for each FFRDC be 10 percent lower than the current fiscal period's appropriated level.

The Committee further observes that, since Congress's actions last year, OSD has failed even to create a master plan to ensure independent control over the budget and manpower levels of the FFRDC's, to fund them at a more realistic and constrained level, and to set priorities for their work. Service parochialism and resistance to any OSD attempts to constrain FFRDC budget and personnel growth have delayed completion of any plan for many months.

Despite OSD and service claims that the FFRDC's, and their funding requests, are being managed more rigorously, the Committee finds that low-priority and duplicative projects still are being approved, and the Department still proposes substantial spending increases for most of the FFRDC's.

A review of the FFRDC's fiscal year 1991 research plans has disclosed several projects which could have been eliminated without any impact on national security or the ability of the particular service to accomplish its mission. These studies are a prime example of the problems with the current Defense Department's ability to manage the FFRDC's and reduce cost growth.

In addition, the Committee staff has learned that some FFRDC's may be including unacceptably high air travel costs in their proposed reimbursement agreements with the Government.

In response, the Committee recommends a general provision limiting total fiscal year 1992 spending for defense FFRDC's to an amount which is 10 percent less than the total amount originally appropriated for these organizations in fiscal year 1991.

The Committee has included further guidance about one FFRDC subcomponent in the classified annex to the Committee report.

CONTRACTOR TRAVEL

The Committee examination of the fiscal year 1992 budget request disclosed that the Defense Department lacks adequate information about the amount of funds contractors are being reimbursed for air travel costs in weapons development programs. For example, the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Air Force have admitted they do not know how much contractors spend on air travel.

The last three Defense Appropriations Acts have reduced air travel costs by an average of \$31,000,000 annually for Government and contractor personnel based on the expected use of discount air

fares. This reduction was applied to both the RDT&E and procurement appropriations accounts.

However, based on latest information, the Committee understands it now can be estimated conservatively that contractor costs annually for air travel could exceed \$500,000,000 just in the RDT&E account. Considering this large amount, the Committee believes it is reasonable to consider increasing the amount of savings based on the use of discount air fares. Also, further savings can be anticipated from new negotiations between industry and the domestic airlines for contractor discount air fares.

In view of this situation, the Committee recommends reductions in the four major RDT&E accounts to increase savings to the Government to \$100,100,000 for fiscal 1992 from wider use of discount air fares. The Committee initially had considered deleting \$300,000,000 in air travel-related savings but has decided on a lesser amount to permit the Defense Department to implement this reduction beginning January 1, 1992, instead of October 1, 1991.

The Committee also recommends that: (a) the Pentagon prohibit the reimbursement of any contractor personnel for travel costs in excess of a Government-negotiated discount fare for air travel between the same locations and (b) the Pentagon work with the defense and airline industries to increase availability of discount air fares to defense contractors traveling on Government contract business.

The Committee would like to put the Defense Department on notice that it will consider proposing a statutory ban on reimbursement of contractor air travel costs in excess of Government fares if the Pentagon does not impose such a ban administratively and does not move aggressively to control such travel costs through increased cooperation with the defense and airline industries.

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH GRANT ABUSES

In response to well-publicized abuses in university research grants, the Committee recommends reductions totaling \$78,000,000 in the major RDT&E appropriations accounts to save money and improve the management of defense dollars supporting such grants.

The proposed reductions anticipate the implementation of the Office of Management and Budget [OMB] proposed limit on overhead costs to prevent future abuses, and more effective cost negotiating by the Defense Department with university grant practitioners.

The Committee observes that university grant negotiators in the Department of Health and Human Services [HHS], which manages most Defense Department university grants, average 9 percent lower costs than Pentagon negotiators. The Committee understands that OMB is reviewing which Department should be responsible for managing Federal university grants. It is significant to note that the chief of DOD's current grants administration office has said the Department has experienced no problems in terms of responsiveness or quality of research with those grants already administered by HHS.

The Committee warns the Defense Department that it will consider legislation next year to transfer full management responsibilities for DOD university research grants to the Department of Health and Human Services [HHS] if DOD's cost negotiating performance does not improve significantly.

Specific reductions are recommended in each of the RDT&E accounts. The House did not recommend similar reductions.

SPACE-BASED WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE PROGRAMS

The Committee last year denied funds for premature, costly, and duplicative space-based wide area surveillance [SBWAS] programs proposed by the Navy and the Air Force. The Committee mandated that a study be done by the Office of the Secretary of Defense [OSD] to assess alternatives to these programs and to provide better information to evaluate technological goals and military requirements in this area.

The Committee also recommended a general provision which became law to prevent Federal funds available in fiscal year 1991 from being used for RDT&E for the Navy and Air Force programs.

Despite repeated warnings that lack of the required report would severely hamper Committee consideration of any fiscal year 1992 budget request for SBWAS programs, OSD failed to accomplish the needed analytical effort. Instead, the Department has requested funds for this study in fiscal year 1992.

The Committee recommends approval of the funds sought for this essential study. However, the funds requested for the Navy and Air Force technology programs again are denied.

Although the Navy and Air Force programs have been rescoped into supposedly less ambitious efforts, they still represent a costly investment which cannot be justified without much firmer information about possible alternatives, technology goals, and military requirements.

The Committee also recommends that last year's statutory provision be repeated in the fiscal year 1992 act, with modification to include all relevant program elements. The statutory language is recommended due to the lack of adherence during fiscal year 1990 to the Committee's report language restrictions on these programs.

RDT&E REPROGRAMMING ISSUES

Last year, the Committee recommended report language expressing concern with abuses of the established reprogramming procedures with respect to certain below-threshold reprogramming actions in the RDT&E accounts. Additional restrictions were proposed to eliminate these abuses.

A new restriction changed the maximum limit for cumulative, below-threshold reprogrammings from any separate program, project, or activity. The limit was set at \$4,000,000 or 20 percent of the funds appropriated for that endeavor in the fiscal year of the proposed reprogramming, whichever was the lesser amount.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense has sought a relaxation of this new limit to eliminate those actions involving extremely small amounts of funds. In response, the Committee directs that the reprogramming limit be set at a maximum ceiling of \$4,000,000 with-

out prior Committee approval through established reprogramming procedures. In addition, the Committee directs that no funds may be transferred without prior approval from any activity to which Congress added funds during the annual appropriations process.

Finally, the Committee reemphasizes its strongly held position, and direction, that absolutely no new start subprojects, projects, or programs are to be initiated through any below threshold reprogramming action. In addition, the Committee believes the reprogramming process—for both above-threshold and below-threshold actions—primarily is intended to address unforeseen or emergency situations. New initiatives rarely fall into these categories and the Committee cautions OSD and the military departments it is predisposed against even considering any such initiatives outside the regular annual budget request and appropriations process.

RDT&E INFRASTRUCTURE AND GENERAL SUPPORT PROGRAMS

The Committee recommends that several Defense Department RDT&E infrastructure and general support programs be restrained or reduced instead of being granted requested budget increases. This action is taken in view of the expected continued constraints on future defense spending and the anticipated further contraction of the Defense Department RDT&E infrastructure.

The Committee notes that Project Reliance, the Laboratory Closure and Consolidation Commission study, and the current and future Base Closure and Realignment Commission decisions could result in further reduction in the Defense Department's RDT&E laboratories, test, ranges, and support installations. The Committee is reluctant to invest excessive funds in facilities which may have significantly modified roles and missions in the future defense RDT&E establishment.

The Committee also directs that no single installation should be allocated a disproportionate share of any reduction made to any specific program element in these categories.

The Committee observes that the military services have each announced major consolidation and closure initiatives affecting their research, development, test, and evaluation [RDT&E] infrastructure. The Project Reliance process is reviewing the facilities and capabilities in 18 different areas in an effort to eliminate duplication and identify a lead agency responsible for maintaining and developing test capabilities in each area. In addition, the services have been unable to define how much testing is conducted at their respective ranges and test facilities to support the fiscal year 1992 budget request.

Yet, despite the noted efforts to consolidate test facilities and test capabilities, each of the services' budgets contain substantial growth in funds requested for test and evaluation support and real property maintenance at test facilities.

The Committee is concerned by this apparent conflict between the expected further contraction of the defense RDT&E infrastructure and increasing budget requests for facilities expansion or maintenance. The Committee's previously expressed reluctance extends to spending funds to maintain test facilities which provide excess or duplicative capacity, which may be unnecessary as a

result of the services' Project Reliance decisions, and which may be unsupported as defense spending declines.

The Committee believes that the services should review the amount of testing projected under future defense budgets and realistically assess the maintenance and repair requirements at ranges and test facilities in preparing the fiscal year 1993 budget request. The Committee directs the Department of Defense to develop a standard measure defining the use of each of the services' test facilities to support any requested funding in fiscal year 1993.

MEDICAL RESEARCH INITIATIVES

Infectious disease research.—The Committee believes that the Department of Defense Infectious Disease Research Program is a valuable national resource and should be maintained as a strong, coherent program with full participation of the Army and Navy.

The Armed Services Biomedical Research and Evaluation Management Committee [ASBREM] was formed at the direction of the Congress in 1982 to ensure that the medical research and development program, including the Infectious Disease Program, would be coordinated and nonduplicative. The Committee believes that the ASBREM has served this purpose well for most elements of the program, but it has been unable to resolve perceived problems in the infectious disease area where the Army is the designated lead agent.

One of the weaknesses of the ASBREM has been the lack of nonpartisan leadership. To provide this nonpartisan leadership, the Committee directs that the ASBREM membership be expanded to include the Director of Defense Research and Engineering [DDR&E], or his designated representative, as the chairman. The chairman will be vested with the authority to resolve interservice differences. The Committee also directs the ASBREM under the leadership of the DDR&E to assure that mechanisms are put into place to provide open communication between the services on funding of infectious disease research and any other areas as needed.

The Committee is sensitive to the perceived problems the Army and the Navy have had in the Infectious Disease Program and hopes that the addition of a nonpartisan leader may assist in resolving these problems.

The Committee agrees with the House that the Army, as lead agent, should assure that total funding for the Navy-sponsored infectious disease research is \$15,238,000. It has made an increase of \$5,500,000 for the Navy program funded by the Army, in the following Army program elements: (a) defense research sciences, \$1,000,000; (b) medical technology, \$4,000,000; and (c) medical advanced technology, \$500,000.

In addition, the Committee has added \$1,000,000 above the budget request to the Navy medical development program element for infectious disease research. This action provides a total of \$16,238,000 to the Navy's infectious disease research program to maintain it at the fiscal year 1991 level.

Human immunodeficiency virus [HIV] research.—The Committee commends the Army for its success in developing an agent which appears to boost the immune systems of persons suffering from the

HIV virus. In the light of this success, the Committee believes that it is important to continue this work at the fiscal year 1991 level and has added \$26,750,000 above the budget request to accomplish this purpose. Funds are added to the following Army program elements: (a) medical technology, \$2,000,000; and (b) AIDS research, \$24,750,000.

Nutrition research.—The Committee recommends the addition of \$1,750,000 to continue three ongoing projects approved by the Army Research Institute of Environmental Medicine and the Committee on Military Nutrition on stable isotope energy assessment, nutritional neuroscience research, and nutrition and military performance clinical laboratory research.

The Committee also recommends the addition of \$750,000 to conduct menu modification and health promotion research in conjunction with the Army Medical Research and Development Command. These funds are allocated to the following Army program elements: (a) defense research sciences, \$500,000; (b) medical technology, \$1,000,000; and (c) medical advanced technology, \$1,000,000.

Bone marrow research.—The Committee agrees with the House in adding \$20,000,000 to the Navy's Medical Development Program element for bone marrow research. Of this amount, \$6,000,000 will go to the C.W. Bill Young Marrow Donor Recruitment and Research Program to continue its donor recruitment program and to maintain research on state-of-the-art DNA tissue typing technology. The remaining \$14,000,000 will be provided to the National Marrow Donor Program to continue donor recruitment and education activities.

Nursing research.—The Committee has recommended an additional \$1,000,000 in a new program element in the "Defense agencies" account for the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences to be used only for nursing research projects approved by the chief nurses of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Laser burn treatment.—The Committee recommends an addition of \$1,000,000 to a new Army program element to be used only to support advanced laser burn treatment diagnostics and therapeutic research, as authorized in the Senate-passed Defense authorization bill.

Neurofibromatosis research.—The Committee adds \$4,000,000 to the budget request for research into this disease.

Center for Prostate Disease Research.—The Committee allocates \$2,000,000 in bill language to initiate a Center for Prostate Disease Research at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research. The Committee recognizes the widespread incidence of prostate disease among men and believes the Department of Defense, with sophisticated medical history and treatment recordkeeping systems, can provide a unique body of knowledge and understanding of the detection and symptomology of prostate disease. The Committee hopes that the creation of this center, to gather and evaluate disease and treatment data, may ultimately grow to undertake direct research on new technologies and methods to prevent, diagnose, and treat prostate disease.

COMPUTER-AIDED ACQUISITION AND LOGISTICS SUPPORT CONSOLIDATION

In addition to the reductions discussed elsewhere in this chapter, the Committee recommends several RDT&E adjustments to consolidate all computer-aided acquisition and logistics support [CALS] activities under the Office of the Secretary of Defense. This action is recommended to provide central, more effective management to these activities. Similar adjustments are recommended in the "Operations and maintenance" and "Procurement" accounts.

The recommended RDT&E adjustments are:

Navy: Advanced technology transition.....	-\$4,400,000
Air Force:	
Aerospace vehicle technology.....	- 500,000
Logistics systems technology.....	- 8,000,000
Personnel, training, and simulation.....	- 900,000
R&M maturation/technology insertion.....	- 20,999,000
Command, control, communications.....	- 300,000
Defense agencies:	
Computer aided logistics support.....	- 10,475,000
Manufacturing technology.....	- 4,600,000

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY

Appropriations, 1991.....	\$5,607,379,000
Budget estimate, 1992.....	6,307,300,000
House allowance.....	6,241,621,000
Committee recommendation.....	6,280,361,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,280,361,000, a reduction of \$26,939,000 to the budget request. The recommendation is \$38,740,000 above the House allowance.

SUMMARY TABLE

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Change from budget
Technology base.....	819,709	841,862	+ 22,153
Advanced technology development.....	302,531	353,781	+ 51,250
Strategic programs.....	87,186	87,186	
Tactical programs.....	3,585,364	3,531,954	- 53,410
Intelligence and communications.....	146,314	150,904	+ 4,590
Defensewide mission support.....	1,366,196	1,304,174	- 62,022

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

Contractor travel.—The Committee recommends reducing the Army's RDT&E budget request by \$15,897,000 due to expected savings from increased contractor use of discount air fares. Further rationale is presented in the principal Committee observations section of this chapter. The House allowance does not make such a reduction.

Defense research sciences; other technology base university grants.—As explained in the principal Committee observations section, the Committee recommends \$173,891,000, a net reduction of \$5,472,000, to the budget request and an amount \$26,972,000 below the House allowance for Army defense research sciences. This pro-

gram element supports basic research in subjects of broad military interest. A reduction of \$6,972,000 is recommended in funds requested for university grants in the defense research sciences program element. A reduction of \$3,452,000 also is recommended in funds requested for university grants in the exploratory and advanced development program elements.

These reductions are associated with savings due to expected changes in the allowable overhead rate charges on university research grants, and from more effective cost negotiating by the Defense Department with university practitioners.

The recommendation adds \$1,000,000 for infectious disease research and \$500,000 for nutrition research in agreement with House recommendations. Further elaboration on these medical initiatives is included in the principal Committee observations section.

Command, control, communications technology.—The Committee recommends \$18,726,000 and denies the \$500,000 requested as the Army's share of a new start light satellite project in the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA]. This project proposes to develop a small, extremely high frequency communications satellite as a follow-on to Milstar satellites. The estimated \$230,000,000 total project cost is significantly underfunded in both Army and DARPA out-year budgets. This new satellite development effort is premature, given the first Milstar satellite has yet to fly and the initial constellation will not be fully deployed for many years. The House allowance provides the requested level of funding.

International cooperative research and development.—The Committee recommends \$1,506,000, a reduction of \$456,000 and an equal amount below the House allowance for this program element. The adjustment eliminates funds not expected to be spent in fiscal year 1992 due to slow execution of fiscal year 1991 funds.

Electronic warfare [EW] development.—The Committee recommends \$116,550,000, a reduction of \$31,710,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$21,450,000 below the House allowance, for this program element to develop advanced EW capabilities for Army systems.

The recommendation denies \$20,200,000 to terminate the Stingray optical countermeasures project and \$2,000,000 for other new start optical countermeasures activities under the aircraft survivability equipment project. The Committee directs that the three services and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA] create a joint program in fiscal year 1993 in DARPA to meet tri-service aircraft and vehicle needs in this area. The Committee understands that a DARPA project already is developing technologies with the potential to be smaller, lighter, more efficient, more powerful, and more advanced optical countermeasures capability.

The Committee believes that Stingray's operational utility in its intended mission has been contradicted by Operation Desert Storm experience.

The Committee also reduced \$4,910,000 from the program element due to lower than planned obligations during fiscal year 1991.

Another \$4,600,000 is deleted since the Army decided to eliminate them from program plans after the budget was submitted.

Armored systems modernization [ASM]—advanced development.—The Army's fiscal year 1992 amended budget request includes \$400,808,000 for the continued development of the next generation of armored vehicles for the heavy force. The Committee recommends \$359,008,000 for fiscal year 1992, a reduction of \$41,800,000 from the budget request.

Operation Desert Shield/Storm and the recent events in the Soviet Union have caused this Committee to reexamine the Army's plan to develop and field a system of systems for the heavy forces on a proposed common chassis. As has been noted by other defense committees this year, the justification and analytic foundation of the ASM program has been shaken by lessons learned in Kuwait and the dramatic and ongoing changes in the Soviet Union. The Committee understands and supports the need to develop a future generation tank. In light of these recent events, however, the Committee must question the timing and composition of the current ASM program. The Committee has taken its position in the absence of answers to five key questions that must be resolved before any long-term consensus can develop on modernizing heavy forces.

First, the Committee and the Department must determine how recent world events have changed the need for the development and deployment of a block III tank in the year 2003. The Army has always viewed the block III tank as its first priority in the ASM program and justifies building the tank first by citing the need to counter the future Soviet tank 3 [FST-3] in the early part of the next decade. However, the Army has acknowledged that changes in the Soviet Union have caused the intelligence community to conclude that deployment of the FST-3 will be delayed beyond the date used by the Army to initially justify the need to deploy the block III tank. Couple this with the superb performance of the M-1A1 tank in Desert Shield/Storm, the Committee must question the need to continue the current development schedule of the block III tank.

Second, the Committee must question the affordability of the currently structured ASM program in a rapidly declining defense budget. Projected funding requirements for the ASM program are expected to peak between fiscal year 1998-2007 at the same time as the Army's other major modernization programs. The Comanche, will also require a large portion of the Army's procurement budget. This affordability question is further exacerbated by the fact that the budget summit reductions in fiscal year 1994 and the out-years have yet to be allocated among domestic, defense, and international accounts. Prudent budgeting requires the Committee to assume that a large portion of the reductions will be taken by the defense account. In this case, current Army out-year budget planning is overstated and will have to be adjusted downward.

Third, the Department must study anew what contingency the ASM program is intended to meet and how mobile this family of armored vehicles must be when deployed. In May of last year, the defense ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] concluded that under the limits imposed by the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe [CFE], the Soviet Union will

lack sufficient conventional forces and capabilities to launch a European-wide strike. This conclusion preceded the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact as a war-fighting coalition and even the uncertain dissolution of the Soviet Union itself. The Committee now must conclude that conventional conflict with the Soviet Union on the European continent, without long warning times, is a most unlikely scenario. If this assessment is correct, how much longer will it be necessary to forward deploy any U.S. heavy ground forces in Europe, the bedrock contingency which is central to the justification of the block III tank? The most likely contingencies for U.S. forces in the near term are limited regional conflicts requiring rapid and long-range deployments of U.S. forces. Desert Storm demonstrated that armored forces have a critical role in future regional conflicts. The ASM program, therefore, should focus on advance technologies that provide the firepower and survivability of heavy forces, but with much reduced vehicle weight and logistics burdens.

Fourth, the Army and Congress must finally determine whether or not the United States can afford to preserve the current tank industrial base while continuing to develop the block III tank. All four defense committees believe that it is vital to preserve this industrial base and have demonstrated their support by adding \$225,000,000 to the Army's budget to begin a M-1 series tank upgrade program in fiscal year 1992. The Office of the Secretary of Defense [OSD], however, continues to oppose this upgrade program and has given no indication to Congress or the Army that OSD will change its position.

Finally, the Committee is convinced that the M-1A1 tank will meet any credible threat throughout the remainder of this decade. U.S. artillery, on the other hand, requires both near- and long-term improvements. While the near-term fix may be solved by the M-109A6 Paladin, the Committee believes that the long-term solution should not be held hostage to the fortunes of the block III tank.

The Committee concludes that these questions must be answered before proceeding with the common chassis approach to the ASM program and the block III tank. The Committee, therefore, reduces the common chassis advanced technology transition demonstrator [CCATTD] (Project DB-83) by \$125,000,000 and bill language directs that no more than \$25,000,000 of funds remaining for the CCATTD may be obligated until 30 days after the President has submitted a new national intelligence estimate of potential adversarial armored and antiarmor systems and capabilities and the Army provides a report to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations which addresses the subjects outlined above, and restructures the ASM for fiscal year 1992 and the out-years.

Further, the Army has budgeted \$47,568,000 for the continued development of the next generation 155 mm self-propelled howitzer system known as the advanced field artillery system [AFAS]. The Committee recommends \$110,768,000 for AFAS development work in fiscal year 1992, an increase of \$49,300,000 for AFAS acceleration and \$13,900,000 for Unicharge propellant.

Last year Congress authorized and appropriated additional funding above the budget request and directed the Army to accelerate the advanced field artillery system development efforts. The Army

prepared a fiscal year 1992 budget request which followed the intent of Congress only to have the Office of the Secretary of Defense reduce the Army's AFAS request by \$31,000,000 prior to submission to Congress.

The Committee reiterates its intent: the Army is directed to accelerate the AFAS program to ensure the earliest deployment of the AFAS that is technically and programmatically feasible. To this end, the Committee recommends an additional \$49,300,000 be added back into the AFAS program to fully fund this effort. The Committee also designates the advanced field artillery system as a congressional interest program and directs the Department to so annotate the DD 1414.

The Committee also recommends an additional \$13,900,000 to begin full-scale development of the Unicharge propellant system in fiscal year 1992. The Committee strongly supports the development and fielding of the Unicharge propellant system, regardless of the propellant selected for the AFAS.

Unicharge is a 6.1-inch diameter, 6-inch long rigid combustible cylinder containing standard granular propellant. This standard increment will be used in multiples of up to six cylinders to provide the same range coverage of the current bag propellants. Using standard increments eliminates the need to dispose of unused powder bags, a wasteful and environmentally damaging practice required in current generation nonstandard bag charges.

Unicharge will be compatible with every 39 caliber 155 mm howitzer in United States and our allies' army inventories. The U.S. inventory alone exceeds of 4,300 guns, valued at over \$4,500,000,000. Unicharge will also be compatible with the Howitzer Improvement Program's [HIP] Paladin currently being fielded, as well as the 52 caliber AFAS when deployed. Unicharge will meet the requirements of the Joint Ballistic Working Group on Extended Range Ordnance to which the United States, United Kingdom, Italy, and France will be signatories. Finally, the production base for solid propellant Unicharge is already in place as a result of a \$6,000,000,000 investment in current bag charge facilities. No new facilities need be built.

The Committee understands that approximately \$30,000,000 will be needed to complete full-scale development and type classification of Unicharge for 39 caliber guns by fiscal year 1995. The Committee expects the Army to restructure its Unicharge program to proceed into full-scale development in fiscal year 1992 and budget for the completion of 39 caliber-type classification by the end of fiscal year 1995.

Finally, the Committee provides an additional \$20,000,000 to begin the development of a new or modified vehicle to meet the critical shortfall identified in Operation Desert Storm for a survivable command and communication vehicle capable of keeping up with M-1 tanks and Bradley fighting vehicles.

Light armed scout helicopter.—The Committee recommends \$499,754,000, a reduction of \$8,000,000 to the budget request and an equal amount below the House allowance, for this program to develop the Army's light armed scout helicopter [LH]. The recommendation deletes \$8,000,000 for a premature new start project to

begin designs for integrating the Longbow fire control radar into the LH helicopter.

The action to eliminate funds for integration of the Longbow radar on LH will permit the contractor team to focus on the complex research and development required to integrate Longbow into the Apache helicopter without diversion of personnel resources. The Committee has been informed by the Defense Department that the Apache Longbow project already suffers from excessive cost and delinquent schedule problems.

In addition, the Pentagon identified funds for Longbow LH as lower priority and premature until more research and development is accomplished on the basic Apache Longbow.

In-house laboratory independent research.—The Committee recommends \$8,946,000, a reduction of \$5,866,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$3,866,000 below the House allowance for this program element. The adjustment is made due to overall budget constraints and the expectation of the significant contraction of the defense RDT&E infrastructure.

Army Kwajalein Atoll.—The Committee recommends \$180,964,000, a reduction of \$500,000 and an equal amount below the House allowance in this program element which funds maintenance and operation of the U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll's [USAKA] sophisticated equipment to monitor missile flight tests. The recommendation denies \$2,000,000, an authorization reduction approved by the full Senate, and adds \$1,500,000 only for the completion of a formal environmental impact statement [EIS] for the strategic target system [STARS] program. The STARS program develops a rocket booster to launch equipment and flight test vehicles from the Navy's Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai, HI, to Kwajalein Atoll for the strategic defense initiative.

The need for a formal EIS is addressed in the Defense agencies section of this chapter. The funds are added to this program element because the STARS booster trajectory extends to the atoll's adjacent ocean area. The atoll's data-gathering instruments play an essential role in the STARS program.

Army technical test instrumentation and targets.—The budget request for this program includes 23-percent growth compared to the fiscal year 1991 appropriation, not including the transfer of additional funds into this program element. The budget request is inconsistent with the expected contraction and consolidation of the defense research, development, test, and evaluation infrastructure.

The Committee is reluctant to invest excessive funds in defense facilities which may be closed or consolidated as a result of the service's Project Reliance decisions and future base realignment and closure processes. The recommendation provides \$90,028,000, a reduction of \$13,711,000 to the budget request due to overall budget constraints and these concerns. This amount is \$1,089,000 above the House allowance.

The Committee directs that \$14,300,000 of the funds recommended for this program element are available only for acquisition of Global Positioning System Range Applications Joint Program Office instrumentation.

Army user test instrumentation and threat simulators.—The Committee recommends \$35,434,000, a reduction of \$10,400,000 to the

budget request and an equal amount below the House allowance for this program which develops equipment for Army test ranges. The budget request includes \$18,000,000 to proceed with rapid development of the mobile army instrumentation system [MAIS]. The Committee understands the need for the MAIS system to support realistic testing in a large-scale battle environment and also recognizes the usefulness of the MAIS system as a training system. However, the Committee is concerned that the MAIS system does not use a standard interface and signal format, called a protocol data unit [PDU], developed by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA]. As each of the armed services focus more attention on realistic testing and training, the Committee believes the tools for monitoring and evaluating these exercises should be interoperable to the maximum extent possible. The recommendation denies \$10,400,000 of the funds requested for MAIS and maintains project funding at the current fiscal year level. The Committee directs that recommended fiscal year 1992 funds may only be used to design and develop equipment which uses the DARPA standard interfaces and PDU data format.

Industrial preparedness.—The Committee deletes all funds for this manufacturing technology activity in the Army program element. The recommendation concurs with an initiative already approved by the full Senate to consolidate all defense manufacturing technology programs under the Office of the Secretary of Defense [OSD]. Report language in the Defense agencies RDT&E section will earmark at the budget request level funds for a particular effort to enhance U.S. manufacturing base capabilities to produce precision optics for sights and visual equipment, as part of the weapons and tracked combat vehicles project transferred from the Army.

AH-64 attack helicopter.—The Committee is aware of a proposal to further enhance the capabilities of the Army's AH-64 Apache attack helicopter. The proposed upgrade to the Apache deserves serious consideration; however, the Committee is reluctant to initiate such a program in fiscal year 1992. The Army has stated that total costs for this program are estimated to be \$1,640,000,000, all of which is unfunded in the Army's future year defense budgets.

The Committee continues to be concerned about the serious underfunding of several major defense programs, including two other high-priority Army modernization initiatives—the LH helicopter and the Armored System Modernization Program's line of sight antitank [LOSAT] missile. The Committee does not wish to exacerbate this fiscal problem and strongly supports DOD initiatives to insure that DOD budgets include the full funding required to execute new and current programs.

The proposed Apache upgrade should be considered for inclusion in the fiscal year 1993–98 defense spending plan. The Committee directs the Army to reevaluate its funding priorities, and report to Congress with the next budget request whether the AH-64 upgrade is fully funded in the fiscal years 1993–98 FYDP.

Army tactical support system [ATSS].—The Army tactical support system is a technology assessment program intended to lead to a system which will augment existing Army combat information gathering assets by providing a dedicated surveillance system to

the tactical commander. The Army did not include funds for this activity in the budget request for next fiscal year.

The Committee has learned the Army still may want to begin such a program during fiscal year 1992. If so, the Committee directs that such a new start will require prior Committee approval.

Materials technology.—The Committee has provided \$16,537,000 for materials technology research, \$5,000,000 more than the amended budget request and the House allowance. The additional \$5,000,000 is provided to continue the exploration of uses of American ductile iron in defense-related applications.

Ductile iron has the potential to provide the strength and durability of forged steel at substantially reduced weight and cost, two savings the Defense Department is always striving to achieve. The Committee feels this is a relatively small investment with potential high returns and, therefore, supports the Senate Armed Services' ductile iron initiative.

Laser weapons technology.—The Committee denies funding for the long-range fiber optic guided missile [Longfog] technology program and reduces this program element by \$4,707,000. The House made no adjustment to this activity.

The Army had intended to provide \$4,707,000 to begin a technology base effort on a multispeed fiber optic guided missile with a range of over 100 kilometers. Given the extreme difficulty the Army has had with fielding a 10- to 20-kilometer fiber optic guided missile system, the Committee suggests the Army should focus its efforts on the immediate challenge of solving the short-range problem before it starts a Longfog development effort.

Electronics and electronic devices.—An increase of \$3,100,000 is recommended to enhance the development of battery technology with the goals of achieving significant cost savings, operational performance, and environmental improvements. Of this amount, \$950,000 is to be used for an ongoing research and development effort on magnesium batteries; \$750,000 to select, study, and build prototype advanced rechargeable batteries; \$400,000 to develop low-to no-mercury batteries to meet Department of Defense alkaline and zinc/carbon battery performance requirements; \$500,000 to continue efforts to recycle/reclaim cadmium/mercury cells and batteries; and \$500,000 to develop rechargeable batteries for Navy SEAL requirements.

Environmental quality technology.—The Marine Plastic Pollution Research and Control Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-200) requires the Navy to cease disposing of plastics at sea by the end of 1992. Several approaches to plastic waste disposal at sea including source reduction, controlling, and managing plastics which must be utilized, recycling, and biodegradable packaging for specific applications are being considered. While these activities are most appropriate, there is a need to intensify the effort to develop biodegradable packaging for food and other uses from renewable sources because food contaminated waste cannot be stored on board ship for more than 3 days. The Committee understands the Army's Natick Research, Development, and Engineering Center is responsible for the development and specification for all food items and packaging for the Department of Defense.

The Committee believes that the commercialization of biodegradable plastic for food and other packaging can be accelerated if the Army's Natick Research, Development, and Engineering Center were to work closely with a commercialization team made up of academia, government, and private industry. Therefore, the Committee adds \$5,300,000 for the Natick Center to join this commercialization effort and informs the Army that this is a program of special congressional interest and as such, should be annotated on the DD 1414.

Last year the conferees provided \$100,000 to initiate safety and environmental studies of the White Sands Missile Range [WSMR] as to the feasibility of using WSMR as a possible landing site for the recovery of unmanned life sciences capsules for NASA. The Committee recommends providing \$450,000 in fiscal year 1992 to continue this effort. The Committee further encourages White Sands Missile Range and the Army Test and Evaluation Command [TECOM] to closely cooperate with the State of New Mexico and the Department of the Interior in examining space recovery center and spaceport concepts in southern New Mexico.

Chemical agent detection.—The Army, as the Department of Defense executive agent for chemical and biological warfare, should initiate a program in the detection and identification of biological agents during fiscal year 1992. This program should focus on technologies for both local and remote detection and identification of chemical/biological warfare agents. The goal of this program should be to field some capability in this area as soon as possible.

Landmine warfare and barrier advance technology.—The Army has budgeted \$8,728,000 for advance development of landmine warfare and countermining capabilities by investigating and exploring materials, techniques, and equipment evolving from exploratory development. The Committee recommends \$18,728,000 for this advance technology effort in fiscal year 1992, a \$10,000,000 increase to the budget request but \$5,000,000 below the House allowance.

The recent events in Operations Desert Shield/Storm have demonstrated a significant lack of capability on the part of the Army and Marine Corps to detect and neutralize landmines. While the Army's Research, Development, and Test Center at Fort Belvoir deserves great credit for their development and fielding of the mine rake system in Southwest Asia in record time, this was only an interim solution. Army operational requirements have identified a critical need for in-stride detection and breach, and man-portable standoff and close-in detection and neutralization of landmines.

The Committee notes that only \$6,083,000 has been budgeted for countermining advance development, far less than would be expected if lessons learned from Desert Shield/Storm had been incorporated. The Committee recommends an additional \$10,000,000 be provided specifically for countermining advance technology efforts in fiscal year 1992. The Committee expects that a continued study of long-pulse microwave technology be included as this technology may prove to have significant operational, logistical, and cost advantages over ultrawide band microwave concepts.

Armored systems modernization [ASM]—eng. dev.—The Army has included \$43,109,000 within their fiscal year 1992 amended budget request for the armored gun system [AGS]. The Committee sup-

ports the budget request, which is \$43,109,000 more than was provided by the House.

The Army is pursuing the development of the AGS based on a modified nondevelopmental item [NDI] acquisition approach. The Committee supports this NDI approach for the AGS and has recommended fully funding the program for fiscal year 1992, contrary to the decision of the House to terminate this development effort. The Committee believes that the recent deployments of light forces to Panama and Saudi Arabia justify the need for such a system and that the M-551 Sheridan's questionable survivability can no longer be ignored.

The Committee does not fully agree with the direction of the Senate Armed Service Committee [SASC] which supports the AGS program but directs the Army to use the Marine Corps' LAV-105 turret on the AGS. While the Committee fully agrees with the intent of the SASC to look for opportunities for commonality between the LAV-105 and the AGS, the Committee does not choose to mandate the use of an appropriately modified LAV-105 turret at this time for two reasons. First, there is genuine concern by this Committee as to the future of the LAV-105 within Marine Corps procurement budgets in the out-years. Second, mandating the use of a particular turret eliminates any potential competitor who may wish to take a nontraditional approach to the AGS system, such as an elevated turret. The Committee, however, has no objection to the SASC's desires to mandate the use of the EX-35 gun on the winning AGS design to leverage the investment made thus far on that cannon.

Combat feeding, clothing, and equipment.—The Committee recommends providing \$27,956,000, an increase of \$18,000,000 over the budget request for the Soldier/Marine Enhancement Program.

The Committee does not agree with the House language directing the Army to buy an additional 750 soft mounts for testing in fiscal year 1992. The Army has informed this Committee that only 50 soft mounts are needed for the testing directed by the fiscal year 1991 report. No additional soft mounts beyond the 50 need be procured in fiscal year 1991 or in fiscal year 1992 to complete the required testing.

The Committee, therefore, does not expect the Army to procure any additional soft mounts in fiscal year 1992 and directs the Army to use the \$18,000,000 provided to complete other projects within the Soldier/Marine Enhancement Program.

Nonsystem training devices.—The Army has included \$51,266,000 within its fiscal year 1992 amended budget request for the development of nonsystem training devices. The Committee recommends providing \$61,266,000 for this activity, \$10,000,000 more than the budget request and \$23,366,000 more than the House allowance.

The Committee strongly agrees with the Senate Armed Services Committee belief that distributed simulation will be a key to combat readiness of Active and Reserve units when opportunities for large-scale field exercises are shrinking due to reductions in available training funds and increasing environmental concerns. The Committee also supports the proposed close combat tactical trainer [CCTT] Quick Start Program with some restrictions.

The CCTT program is a \$300,000,000, 7-year development program designed to field a state-of-the-art distributed simulator system, drawing on lessons learned from the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency's SIMNET program. The system will use manned mock-up crew driving and fighting compartments of armored vehicles, computer-generated imagery, and interactive distribution processing. The CCTT program office plans to design its simulation software in Ada, in an open environment architecture utilizing standard data elements and protocols. If successfully implemented, the CCTT system should be easily modified for changes in future threat and friendly hardware and tactics. It will also mean that the CCTT system will not be dependent on a unique set of computer hardware but will be able to run on any operating system in the commercial marketplace, thus lowering life cycle costs. These are commendable and necessary goals to ensure that CCTT will remain state of the art and cost effective well into the next century. The Committee supports these efforts but is justifiably concerned with the ability of the Army to meet these development goals.

The Committee also questions the Army's commitment to the CCTT program and training development in general. The Army has allocated only \$51,000,000 in fiscal year 1992 for the training mission area, eight-tenths of 1 percent of the total "Army research and development" account, and has unfunded requirements for CCTT that total \$418,000,000 through the year 2000. The Committee, therefore, directs the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research, Development, and Acquisition to certify to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations that the close combat tactical trainer system is fully funded in the fiscal years 1993-98 future years defense program [FYDP] and the long-range Army material requirements plan [LRAMRP] prior to the obligation of any funds for the Quick Start Program. Further, no funds may be obligated for the deployment of Quick Start assets until all system software development is concluded and technical and operational testing has been successfully completed.

The Committee is also concerned with the fielding plans for the close combat tactical trainer system. With limited training space and time, the Reserve component needs a fully deployed CCTT system as much if not more than the Active force. The Committee, therefore, expects the Assistant Secretary to also certify that all funding necessary for full deployment to the Reserve component forces, as well as the Active, are fully funded in the fiscal year 1994 FYDP and the LRAMRP. To indicate the Army's desires to deploy CCTT to the Reserve component in a timely manner, the Committee expects that one-third of the Quick Start deployments will be to the Reserve component. The Committee expects that all out-year budgets will maintain an annual two-thirds Active and one-third Reserve component deployment ratio for CCTT until the Reserve component requirements are met.

Logistics and engineer equipment—engineering development.—The Army has requested \$11,474,000 within this program element for LAMP-H engineering development efforts in fiscal year 1992. The Committee strongly supports this program and fully funds the budget estimate.

One of the major lessons learned from Operations Desert Shield/Storm was how critically important the modern ports and airfield facilities which exist in Saudi Arabia were to the ability of the United States to project such a large force in such a short amount of time. This may not be the case in future conflicts, when it may be necessary to respond rapidly with troops and equipment in an area of the world that does not have modern airfields and ports. The LAMP-H will provide the necessary capability for the United States to respond quickly in any area in the world, regardless of the availability of adequate ports and airfields.

According to information provided to the Committee by the Army, the LAMP-H development program, as currently configured, could be accelerated as much as 12 months within existing budgeted and programmed resources. In view of the critical role the LAMP-H may play in future conflicts, the Committee directs the Army to accelerate the program to the maximum extent possible if it is in the best interest of the program and the Government to do so.

Fiber optic guided missile.—The Committee is becoming increasingly frustrated and deeply concerned over the apparent inability of the Army to develop and deploy the non-line-of-sight/fiber optic guided missile [NLOS/FOG-M] system.

The Army testified before Congress over 5 years ago that the FOG-M prototype developed by the Army Missile Command [MICOM] had reached the point where industry could build to print and transition this much needed capability to the operational user. However, the Army's actual execution of the FOG-M development contract with industry proved that they did not believe their own testimony.

The Army began the development process by changing the requirements of the FOG-M from an antitank role to the antihelicopter mission, doubling the range requirement, requiring a variable speed motor for a fast dash to the target area and a reduced speed for acquisition and engagement, incorporating a high-resolution television and infrared seekers, and adding a sophisticated warhead. As a result of these program changes, there was more than a 300-percent increase in cost and a 200-percent increase in schedule relative to the initial industry bid. While the Army deserves much of the blame for the resultant cancellation of the program, the industry team must be looked to for its share. The initial industry bid for FSD was approximately \$160,000,000, almost one-half the Government cost estimate, giving rise to charges of buying-in. Further, there appeared to be a lack of management oversight by the prime contractor, as evidenced by several changes in program management during this period.

On July 12, 1991, the Army Systems Acquisition Review Council [ASARC] approved a new Army plan to restart the FOG-M program. As briefed to the Committee, the new plan appears to be a realistic attempt to get an operational FOG-M system deployed prior to the end of this century within a reasonable cost. As briefed, the Army intends to use the mature television-based rocket and light launcher system designed during the initial operational evaluation [IOE] program as the baseline system. A competitive contract will be awarded in fiscal year 1994 for a 36-month engi-

neering manufacturing development [EMD] phase with first unit equipped with day-only TV missiles in fiscal year 1998. At a later date, the Army intends to follow the TV missile development with the development and integration of an IR seeker for night and adverse weather capabilities.

The Committee supports the Army's plan as outlined. The Committee, however, is concerned with the operational user's reaction and support for the deployment of a day-only system initially. The Committee notes that MICOM has several IR seekers left over for the terminated program and questions how much additional time, funds, and risk would be experienced if the TV and IR seekers were integrated at the same time.

The Committee directs the Army to use \$25,000,000 of available prior year funds to restart the program in fiscal year 1992.

All source analysis system [ASAS].—The Committee recommended program provides for a realignment of \$21,500,000 from the all source analysis system to the sustaining bases information system [SBIS] in other procurement, Army as requested by the Army.

The all source analysis system will be used by frontline Army intelligence analysts to quickly combine intelligence gathered by aircraft, helicopters, reconnaissance units, satellites, electronic eavesdroppers, and commando forces. It will enable commanders to make informed decisions quickly and supports fire support weapons systems, such as the multiple launch rocket system [MLRS]. Experience in the gulf war highlighted the need to speed up the basic data base operations that are the heart of ASAS. It is critical to combine and assess the various sources of information quickly so that targets are not lost before action can be taken.

Massive parallel architectures in combination with relational data base technology promises the highest performance in terms of transactions per second. Use of this technology will dramatically speed ASAS data base operations. The ASAS techbase program has supported research on hypercubes for many years and has the experience to rapidly exploit this new technology. The evolving nature of ASAS and the need to support higher performance in many of its functions argues strongly for expediting this technology transfer into the ASAS program. The Committee, therefore, recommends an additional \$6,000,000 for the ASAS techbase program for the purchase of a high-speed hypercube computer, and for the necessary commercial off-the-shelf relational data base software.

Medium tactical vehicles.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$11,600,000 in fiscal year 1992 for medium tactical truck development. Specifically, the Committee supports the \$9,100,000 provided by the authorization committee to accelerate the Service Life Extension Program [SLEP] and the \$2,500,000 to evaluate a cab-over variant of the heavy high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle [HMMWV].

Missile/air defense product improvement.—The Army has requested \$53,042,000 for continued product improvements to the Patriot, Hawk, Avenger, and Stinger-RMP missile systems in fiscal year 1992. The Committee recommends providing \$58,042,000 for these activities in fiscal year 1992, an increase of \$5,000,000 above the budget request and the House allowance.

One of the major lessons learned from Operation Desert Shield/Storm was the serious availability problem the Army experienced with the Patriot missile system's 150 kilowatt generator. Considering the critically important role the Patriot system played in Saudi Arabia and Israel and the future role Patriot will play in almost any scenario, the Committee cannot accept any further delays in solving this generator problem.

The Committee directs the Army to establish a joint working group to assess the Patriot system's power requirements, conduct a market survey and tradeoff analysis to evaluate life cycle costs, reliability, and performance of off-the-shelf generator systems and developmental power systems. The working group will report to the Committees on authorization and Appropriations, not later than June 1, 1992, the results of this market survey and provide an acquisition plan for a replacement generator for the Patriot missile system. This plan will include all costs associated with development, facilitization, and production of this new generator and the dates of all key milestone events. The Committee provides \$5,000,000 for this effort in fiscal year 1992 but directs the Army to budget for the continuation of this program in fiscal year 1993 and the out-years.

Vectored thrust combat ability demonstrator.—The Committee welcomes the Army's implementation of the advanced rotorcraft vectored thrust combat ability demonstrator [VTCAD] program, pursuant to congressional direction of last year. This valuable technology project was conceived to provide a means for improving the agility, speed, and range of existing and future Army and U.S. Marine Corps attack rotorcraft. The Committee, therefore, reiterates its support for the Army's continued progress toward flight testing of this innovative technology.

Harpy.—The Committee is aware of a proposal for the Army to consider testing the ground-launched Harpy antiradar drone. The Committee urges the Army to consider acquiring such drones for actual hands on test and hardware demonstration in the United States of the Harpy system.

The Committee also directs the Army to assess the Harpy system and other viable alternatives for meeting validated Army requirements. This assessment should include a comparison of Harpy and alternative systems from the perspectives of cost, affordability, manpower and force structure implications, and operational effectiveness against a full range of threats.

OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends incorporating the following adjustments to the budget estimate, in accordance with the Senate authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Weapons and munitions adv tech.....	40,865	49,365	43,865	+ 3,000	- 5,500
Forward area air defense system (FAAD alternative)	97,387	97,387	107,387	+ 10,000	+ 10,000
Advanced antitank weapons system—eng dev.....	120,412	120,412	49,512	- 70,900	- 70,900
Joint surveillance/target attack radar system					
[JSTARS]—ground station modules.....	48,721	48,721	73,721	+ 25,000	+ 25,000
Defense business operations fund [DBOF]—technical					
correction for DTIC.....			7,300	+ 7,300	+ 7,300
DBOF-technical correction for IACS.....			3,200	+ 3,200	+ 3,200

House actions agreed to.—The Committee agrees with the following recommendations contained in the House allowance:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Aviation technology.....	45,544	51,844	51,844	+ 6,300	

House actions not agreed to.—The Committee disagrees with the following recommendations contained in the House allowance:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Antisatellite weapon [ASAT].....	65,000	51,000	65,000		+ 14,000
Weapons and munitions technology.....	39,463	46,463	39,463		- 7,000
Armed, deployable OH-58D.....	18,671		18,671		+ 18,671
Army test ranges and facilities.....	174,584	171,584	174,584		+ 3,000
RAND Arroyo Center.....	19,974	22,850	19,974		- 2,876
Electromechanics and hypervelocity physics.....	2,959	12,959	2,959		- 10,000
Combat vehicle and automotive technology.....	44,106	37,206	44,106		+ 6,900
Ballistic technology.....	53,977	73,977	53,977		- 20,000
Human factors engineering technology.....	10,372	5,372	10,372		+ 5,000
Logistic technology.....	31,552	34,352	31,552		- 2,800
Smoke obscurant and equipment defeating systems—					
adv.....	17,004	11,004	17,004		+ 6,000
Army data distribution system.....	19,534	22,534	19,534		- 3,000
Tactical surveillance system—adv dev.....	16,828	4,028	16,828		+ 12,800
Night visions systems advanced development.....	6,067	4,867	6,067		+ 1,200
Aviation—adv dev.....	13,828	14,928	13,828		- 1,100
Combat service support computer system evaluation.....	24,635	28,635	24,635		- 4,000
Heavy tactical vehicles.....	5,488		5,488		+ 5,488
Tactical surveillance system—eng dev.....	21,590	10,190	21,590		+ 11,400
Automatic test equipment development.....	11,232	18,232	11,232		- 7,000
Tractor jewel.....	104,372		104,372		+ 104,372
Aviation—eng dev.....	12,517	14,017	12,517		- 1,500
Longbow—eng dev.....	233,201	244,201	233,201		- 11,000
Other missile product improvement program.....	106,638	62,638	106,638		+ 44,000
Technology and vulnerability assessment.....	43,127	48,127	43,127		- 5,000
Technology information activities.....	12,757	8,657	12,757		+ 4,100

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Environmental compliance—prog 6.....	52,474	62,474	52,474		— 10,000
X-ROD.....		34,000			— 34,000
Multipurpose weapon.....		6,000			— 6,000
Advanced antitank weapon system.....		68,300			— 68,300
LOSAT.....	152,255	83,955	152,255		+ 68,300
Combat vehicle improvement programs.....	29,713	71,013	29,713		— 41,300
Maneuver control system.....	31,439	36,439	31,439		— 5,000
Munitions standardization, effectiveness and safety.....	16,293	11,293	16,293		+ 5,000

CLASSIFIED PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to classified programs, as explained in the classified annex to the Committee's report:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Tractor helm.....	66,973	101,973	112,573	+ 45,600	+ 10,600
Survivability enhancements.....	5,769	5,769	20,769	+ 15,000	+ 15,000
Tractor red.....	6,721	6,721	11,721	+ 5,000	+ 5,000
Tactical programs.....	206,307	196,047	167,897	— 38,410	— 28,150
Tractor cage.....	20,966	20,966	24,966	+ 4,000	+ 4,000

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate compared with--
RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL ARMY						
TECHNOLOGY BASE						
IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH.....	14,812	12,812	8,946	-5,866	-3,866	
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES.....	179,363	200,863	173,891	-5,472	-26,972	
OTHER TECH BASE UNIVERSITY GRANTS.....	---	---	-3,452	-3,452	-3,452	
ELECTROMECHANICS AND HYPERVELOCITY PHYSICS.....	2,959	12,959	2,959	---	-10,000	
TRACTOR ROSE.....	1,578	1,578	1,578	---	---	
MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY.....	11,537	11,537	16,537	---	---	
ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY AND FUZING TECHNOLOGY.....	19,799	19,799	19,799	---	---	
SURVIVABILITY ENHANCEMENT.....	5,769	5,769	20,769	---	---	
TRACTOR FIELD.....	2,831	2,831	2,831	---	---	
AVIATION TECHNOLOGY.....	45,544	51,844	51,844	---	---	
EW TECHNOLOGY.....	22,964	22,964	22,964	---	---	
MISSILE TECHNOLOGY.....	25,560	25,560	25,560	---	---	
LASER WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY.....	5,191	5,191	484	---	---	
COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY.....	44,106	37,206	44,106	-4,707	-4,707	
BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY.....	53,977	73,977	53,977	---	---	
CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY.....	50,351	50,351	50,351	---	---	
JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM.....	4,531	4,531	4,531	---	---	
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY.....	39,463	46,463	39,463	---	---	
ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES.....	16,894	25,894	19,994	---	---	
NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY.....	30,005	30,005	30,005	---	---	
HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.....	10,372	5,372	10,372	---	---	
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY.....	18,984	28,984	24,734	---	---	
NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICE TECHNOLOGY.....	3,500	3,500	3,500	---	---	
COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY.....	19,226	19,226	18,726	---	---	
COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY.....	5,702	5,702	5,702	---	---	

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Senate compared with-- Budget estimate	House allowance
MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.....	42,564	42,564	42,564	---	---
MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY.....	16,014	16,014	16,014	---	---
LOGISTICS TECHNOLOGY.....	31,552	34,352	31,552	---	-2,800
MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY.....	89,579	139,579	96,579	+7,000	-43,000
TRACTOR FLOP.....	1,608	1,608	1,608	---	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	---	---	---	---	---
ARMY ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY.....	3,374	2,374	3,374	---	+1,000
MPIM TECHNOLOGY.....	---	7,000	---	---	-7,000
TOTAL, TECHNOLOGY BASE.....	819,709	948,409	841,862	+22,153	-106,547
ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT					
LOGISTICS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	10,455	10,455	10,455	---	---
MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	22,245	26,745	23,745	+1,500	-3,000
LASER BURN TREATMENT.....	---	---	1,000	+1,000	+1,000
PROSTATE DISEASE RESEARCH.....	---	---	2,000	+2,000	---
AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	33,255	33,255	33,255	---	---
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	40,865	49,365	43,865	+3,000	-5,500
AFAS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT.....	---	---	---	---	---
COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	26,037	26,037	26,037	---	---
COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	12,691	12,691	12,691	---	---
HUMAN FACTORS/PERSONNEL/TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	15,672	15,672	15,672	---	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAM.....	5,142	5,142	5,142	---	---
TRACTOR HOLE.....	9,583	9,583	9,583	---	---
TRACTOR DIRT.....	100	100	100	---	---
TRACTOR RED.....	6,721	6,721	11,721	+5,000	+5,000
MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	2,870	2,870	2,870	---	---
PRECOMPETITIVE TECHNOLOGY.....	---	---	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Senate compared with--	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS) RESEARCH...	3,259	16,259	28,009	+24,750	+11,750
EW TECHNOLOGY.....	7,122	7,122	7,122	---	---
TRACTOR MAIL.....	---	---	---	---	---
JOINT TACTICAL MISSILE DEFENSE.....	---	---	---	---	---
MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	19,506	19,506	19,506	---	---
DIRECTED ENERGY.....	---	---	---	---	---
TRACTOR CAGE.....	20,966	20,966	24,966	+4,000	+4,000
TRACTOR TRAILER.....	10,996	10,996	10,996	---	---
LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	8,728	23,728	18,728	+10,000	-5,000
JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM.....	5,431	5,431	5,431	---	---
NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	22,620	22,620	22,620	---	---
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CONTROL EQUIPMENT (H).....	---	---	---	---	---
MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	2,433	2,433	2,433	---	---
ADVANCED ELECTRONIC DEVICES DEVELOPMENT.....	4,036	4,036	4,036	---	---
CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE AND SMOKE ADVANCED TECHNOL	3,174	3,174	3,174	---	---
ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.....	8,624	8,624	8,624	---	-34,000
X-ROD.....	---	34,000	---	---	---
ARMOR GUN SYSTEM.....	---	---	---	---	-6,000
MULTI-PURPOSE WEAPON.....	---	6,000	---	---	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	---	---	---	---	---
ADVANCED SPECIAL OPERATIONS RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND	---	---	---	---	---
TOTAL, ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	302,531	383,531	353,781	+51,250	-29,750

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate compared with--
LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV.....	19,973	19,973	19,973	---	---	---
COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT COMPUTER SYSTEM EVALUATION AND.....	24,635	28,635	24,635	---	---	-4,000
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV.....	29,060	29,060	29,060	---	---	---
MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV.....	32,089	32,089	32,089	---	---	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAM.....	9,417	9,417	9,417	---	---	---
ADVANCED MISSILE SYSTEM-HEAVY.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
METEOROLOGICAL DATA SYSTEMS.....	3,474	3,474	3,474	---	---	---
AIRCRAFT WEAPONS.....	3,012	3,012	3,012	---	---	---
AIRCRAFT PROPULSION SYSTEM.....	41,829	41,829	41,829	---	---	---
ARMED, DEPLOYABLE 06-580.....	18,671	---	18,671	---	---	---
LIGHT ARMED SCOUT HELICOPTER.....	507,754	507,754	499,754	-8,000	---	+18,671
JOINT TACTICAL FUSION PROGRAM.....	130,775	109,269	115,275	-15,500	---	+8,000
ARMY TACTICAL MISSILE SYSTEM (ARMY TACMS).....	---	---	---	---	---	+6,006
NUCLEAR MUNITIONS - ENG DEV.....	4,384	4,384	4,384	---	---	---
MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES.....	11,879	20,979	23,479	+11,600	---	---
SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS - ENG DEV.....	12,988	12,988	12,988	---	---	+2,500
ADVANCED ANTI-TANK WEAPON SYSTEM - ENG DEV.....	120,412	120,412	49,512	-70,900	---	---
LANDMINE WARFARE.....	35,238	35,238	35,238	---	---	-70,900
M1A1 DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES.....	5,488	---	5,488	---	---	---
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL.....	8,971	8,971	8,971	---	---	+5,488
ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)-ENG. DEV.....	43,109	---	43,109	---	---	---
IDENTIFICATION-FRIEND-OR-FOE - ENG DEV.....	---	---	---	---	---	+43,109
NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - ENG DEV.....	26,994	26,994	26,994	---	---	---
COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT.....	9,956	19,956	27,956	+18,000	---	---
NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - ENG DEV.....	51,266	37,900	61,266	+10,000	---	+8,000
CCTV/SIMNET - RESERVE COMPONENTS.....	---	---	---	---	---	+23,366
SPECIAL PURPOSE DETECTORS.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
INTEGRATED METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	4,491	4,491	4,491	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Senate compared with-- Budget estimate	House allowance
TACTICAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ENG DEV.....	21,590	10,190	21,590	---	+11,400
AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE - ENG DE	31,953	31,953	31,953	---	---
AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT.....	11,232	18,232	11,232	---	-7,000
CLASSIFIED PROGRAM - ENG DEV.....	---	---	---	---	---
TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ENG DEV....	20,157	20,157	20,157	---	---
TRACTOR JEWEL.....	104,372	---	104,372	---	+104,372
TRACTOR MARK.....	116,341	116,341	116,341	---	---
TRACTOR HELM.....	66,973	101,973	112,573	+45,600	+10,600
JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM.....	48,721	48,721	73,721	+25,000	+25,000
JOINT INTEROPERABILITY OF TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL S	---	---	---	---	---
AVIATION - ENG DEV.....	12,517	14,017	12,517	---	-1,500
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ENG DEV.....	1,002	1,002	1,002	---	---
CHEMICAL SYSTEMS - ENG DEV.....	---	---	---	---	---
LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV.....	27,607	27,607	27,607	---	---
COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - ENG DEV..	3,007	3,007	3,007	---	---
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV.....	48,599	48,599	48,599	---	---
MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT.	25,937	25,937	25,937	---	---
LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - ENG DEV.....	12,355	12,355	12,355	---	---
FIBER OPTIC GUIDED MISSILE - ENG DEV.....	---	---	---	---	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAM.....	46,699	46,699	42,699	-4,000	-4,000
TRACTOR PULL.....	16,762	16,762	16,762	---	---
SENSE AND DESTROY ARMAMENT MISSILE - ENG DEV.....	150,816	150,816	150,816	---	---
TRACTOR TRAILER.....	---	---	---	---	---
LONGBOW - ENG DEV.....	233,201	244,201	233,201	---	-11,000
TRACTOR CRASH/BALL.....	32,914	32,914	32,914	---	---
ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYSTEMS (ATCCS) ENG DE	23,949	23,949	23,949	---	---
LOSAT.....	152,255	83,955	152,255	---	+68,300
RADAR DEVELOPMENT.....	40,079	40,079	40,079	---	---
FOLLOW-ON LANCE ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT.....	---	---	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate compared with--
JOINT CB POINT OF CONTACT, TEST AND ASSESSMENT.....	5,885	5,885	5,885	---	---	---
ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM.....	48,395	48,395	48,395	---	---	---
COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS.....	29,713	71,013	29,713	---	---	-41,300
MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM.....	31,439	36,439	31,439	---	---	-5,000
155MM SELF-PROPELLED HOWITZER IMPROVEMENTS.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS.....	8,948	8,948	8,948	---	---	---
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS EQUIPMENT UPGRADE PROGRAM.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	6,349	6,349	6,349	---	---	---
FIELD ARTILLERY AMMUNITION SUPPORT VEHICLE.....	814	814	814	---	---	---
MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	53,042	53,042	58,042	+5,000	---	+5,000
OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS.....	106,638	62,638	106,638	---	---	+44,000
TRACTOR RIG.....	13,086	13,086	13,086	---	---	---
TRACTOR CARD.....	7,476	7,476	7,476	---	---	---
TACIT RAINBOW.....	4,992	4,992	4,992	---	---	---
JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
TACJAM.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
SOLDIER/MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	206,307	196,047	167,897	-38,410	---	-28,150
FORCE ENHANCEMENTS-ACTIVE.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
INTEGRATED DEVELOP, TEST AND TRAINING SYS.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
TOTAL, TACTICAL PROGRAMS.....	3,585,364	3,342,892	3,531,954	-53,410	---	+189,062
INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS						
TERRAIN INFORMATION - ENG DEV.....	15,062	15,062	15,062	---	---	---
POSITIONING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	3,957	3,957	3,957	---	---	---
SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT.....	113,411	113,411	113,411	---	---	---
COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC).....	6,615	6,615	6,615	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate compared with--
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO OSD COUNTERNARCOTICS.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	7,269	-1,691	11,859	+4,590	+13,550	---
TOTAL, INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS.....	146,314	137,354	150,904	+4,590	+13,550	=====
DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT						
RAND ARROYO CENTER.....	19,974	22,850	19,974	---	-2,876	---
ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL.....	181,464	181,464	180,964	-500	-500	---
SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH (H).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES.....	174,584	171,584	174,584	---	+3,000	---
ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS.....	103,739	88,939	90,028	-13,711	+1,089	---
ARMY USER TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND THREAT SIMULATORS..	45,834	45,834	35,434	-10,400	-10,400	---
TECHNOLOGY AND VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT.....	43,127	48,127	43,127	---	-5,000	---
DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY.....	28,396	28,396	28,396	---	---	---
METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES.....	21,180	21,180	21,180	---	---	---
MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS.....	23,701	23,701	23,701	---	---	---
EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS.....	22,923	22,923	22,923	---	---	---
SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING.....	66,621	66,621	66,621	---	---	---
PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES.....	95,048	95,048	95,048	---	---	---
INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT...	1,962	1,962	1,506	-456	-456	---
TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES.....	12,757	8,657	12,757	---	+4,100	---
MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY...	16,293	11,293	16,293	---	+5,000	---
RDT&E SUPPORT FOR NONDEVELOPMENTAL ITEMS.....	6,196	6,196	6,196	---	---	---
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE - PROG 6.....	52,474	62,474	52,474	---	-10,000	---
PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS.....	22,526	22,526	22,526	---	---	---
REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE - RDT&E.....	193,971	193,971	193,971	---	---	---
BASE OPERATIONS - RDT&E.....	197,850	197,850	197,850	---	---	---
MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT).....	14,518	14,518	14,518	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Senate compared with--	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS.....	21,058	28,058	---	-21,058	-28,058
RANGE SECURITY.....	---	---	---	---	---
CONTRACTOR TRAVEL.....	---	---	-15,897	-15,897	-15,897
RESCISSION TO BE DETERMINED.....	---	---	---	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT.....	1,366,196	1,364,172	1,304,174	-62,022	-59,998
DBOF TECHNICAL CORRECTION: DTIC.....	---	---	7,300	+7,300	+7,300
DBOF TECHNICAL CORRECTION: IACS.....	---	---	3,200	+3,200	+3,200
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL ARMY.....	6,307,300	6,241,621	6,280,361	-26,939	+38,740

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY

Appropriations, 1991	\$9,037,684,000
Budget estimate, 1992 ¹	8,194,233,000
House allowance	7,464,910,000
Committee recommendation	7,666,142,000

¹ The Navy request and the Committee recommendation do not include the proposed budget amendment correction which provides a reduction of \$851,600,000.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,666,142,000 for the Navy's research, development, test, and evaluation programs, a decrease of \$528,091,000 to the budget request. The recommendation is \$201,232,000 above the House allowance.

SUMMARY TABLE

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Change from budget
Technology base	942,173	919,760	-22,143
Advanced technology development	221,110	203,174	-17,936
Strategic programs	275,011	224,711	-50,300
Tactical programs	5,112,389	4,741,517	-370,872
Intelligence and communications	841,379	856,179	+14,800
Defensewide mission support	802,171	731,601	-70,570

The budget activities and programs funded under this appropriation are discussed below.

CLASSIFIED PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to classified programs, as explained in the classified annex to the Committee's report:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Link saki	24,859			-24,859	
Retract maple	216,173	416,173	250,673	+34,500	-165,500
Classified intelligence and communications	678,821	692,636	693,621	+14,800	+985

OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request to concur, or partially concur, with the Senate-passed defense authorization legislation:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Marine enhancement program.....			12,000	+ 12,000	+ 12,000
Vertical launch ASROC.....	36,933	36,933		- 36,933	- 36,933
ASW standoff weapon (possible SEALANCE).....			20,000	+ 20,000	+ 20,000
V-22A.....		625,000			- 625,000
V-22 prior year transfer.....	(165,000)	(165,000)	(165,000)		
Defense business operations fund [DBOF] technical corrections:					
DTIC.....			6,100	+ 6,100	+ 6,100
IACS.....			2,700	+ 2,700	+ 2,700
Adjustment.....			- 19,600	- 19,600	- 19,600

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

The fiscal year 1992 budget request included many programs which contain: (a) excessive growth; (b) lower priority or premature efforts; (c) activities duplicating those in the other services; (d) funds identified by the Navy or Office of the Secretary of Defense as excess to known fiscal year 1992 program requirements; (e) projects canceled by the Navy after the budget request was submitted; and (f) funds associated with management support and RDT&E overhead functions.

In expectation of the significant contraction of the defense research and development infrastructure due to likely budget constraints, the Committee recommends funding many of these program elements at the fiscal year 1991 level or lower. Any funds identified as excess to known program requirements are eliminated. The Committee recommends the following adjustments:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
In-house lab independent R&D.....	25,868	10,000	17,500	- 8,368	+ 7,500
International RDT&E.....	3,210		2,210	- 1,000	+ 2,210
Antiair warfare/antisurface warfare tech (precision strike cruise missile/defense suppression weapons tech).....	70,517	50,000	68,281	- 2,236	+ 18,281
ASW technology (arctic torpedo tech).....	130,902	130,902	129,257	- 1,645	- 1,645
Aegis combat system engineering (post-baseline 6).....	92,153	92,153	91,465	- 688	- 688
Deep submergence technology (NSW/UUV master plan).....	27,284		23,434	- 3,850	+ 23,434

NEW STARTS DEFERRED OR REDUCED

The Navy's fiscal year 1992 budget request contained new starts of doubtful validity. These doubts occur when the proposed new start is: (a) low priority; (b) lacks firm program plans or military requirements, is poorly defined, or is of questionable technical

nature; (c) is premature or yields a result so far in the future to remove any urgency to begin it now; (d) responds to an uncertain threat; or (e) is underfunded in the future years defense program, signifying weak Navy/Marine Corps commitment to the project. Due to these doubts, the Committee recommends deferring or reducing the following efforts:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Gun weapon system advanced technology	5,134	5,134		-5,134	-5,134
Helicopter development—medium lift replacement.....	63,121	11,621	11,621	-51,500	
Air launched saturation system.....	7,531			-7,531	
Surface combatant ordnance/missiles—Tomahawk block IV.....	28,428	20,428	27,228	-1,200	+6,800

Gun weapon system advanced technology.—This program intends to develop technologies for naval guns for the 21st century. The Navy has yet to define any ship upon which this gun might be deployed, or to establish an initial operational capability for such a weapon. In addition, the Navy's commitment to employment of shipborne guns is demonstrated by the retirement of the battleships. If the Navy believes it needs guns at sea, it should continue to operate the battleships and not develop guns for the next millennium.

Helicopter development/medium lift replacement.—Funds are denied to begin development of a new medium lift helicopter for Marine Corps/Navy missions. This program is unnecessary due to the Committee's initiative to restart CH-46E helicopter production, to add funds for RDT&E on CH-46E upgrades, and to continue V-22A tilt-rotor aircraft research and development.

Air launched saturation system.—This new start is intended to develop a loitering missile to search out and attack enemy emitters or to saturate defenses. As such, the system would accomplish the same mission as the now-terminated Tacit Rainbow missile. The Navy dropped out of the Tacit Rainbow program due to concerns about cost and technical problems. A new start is no less likely to be costly or complex. Considering past history, the service's commitment to such a new program is questionable. Funds are denied.

Surface combatant ordnance/missiles (Tomahawk block IV).—The Navy seeks to begin defining a new variant of the Tomahawk missile before the latest variant, the block III, is fielded. Conceptual studies for such a system are extremely premature.

ENHANCED MODULAR SIGNAL PROCESSOR PROGRAM

The Committee has made several recommendations regarding the Navy's troubled enhanced modular signal processor [EMSP] program, which is contained in several program elements.

EMSP was intended to be a standard signal processor which would be fielded as a critical component of important new Navy antisubmarine warfare systems: (a) the LAMPS Mark III helicop-

ter; (b) the airborne low frequency sonar system [ALFS]; (c) the BSY-2 combat system for the SSN-21 submarine; and (d) the surveillance towed array sensor system [SURTASS]. The system was developed in response to a previously predominant, Soviet open-ocean submarine threat and was intended for deployment on many more U.S. Navy platforms than now will remain in the fleets.

The high cost of the standard processor threatened the overall affordability of the program. The decline in the Soviet open-ocean threat and in U.S. Navy force structure further reduces the justification for EMSP and exacerbates its affordability problems. A special study by the Center for Naval Analyses firmly establishes that less-costly alternatives with sufficient capabilities exist.

Due to these concerns, the Navy decided earlier this year to terminate EMSP. The Navy wanted to be allowed to competitively select a processor that meets the requirement, is economical, and provides low risk. A short time later, the Navy reversed its position. The service now is claiming a much more affordable program is possible, despite the fact that projected EMSP procurement has decreased from about 400 to 150. Furthermore, despite reversing its position, the Navy still is reviewing alternatives to EMSP and its entire EMSP acquisition strategy.

The Committee is skeptical about the proposed restructure for EMSP, especially since lower unit costs are promised for a significantly reduced acquisition objective. The Committee also notes that the number of platforms requiring EMSP in the future may continue to decline in view of the changing international security environment and likely future budget limits. Furthermore, the Committee understands that the Office of the Secretary of Defense has yet to obtain sufficient information from the Navy to evaluate the service's claims that the program now is affordable and warranted.

In view of all these considerations, especially availability of less costly, suitable war-fighting alternatives, the Committee recommends terminating EMSP and deleting all requested fiscal year 1992 funds and available fiscal year 1991 funds associated with the program. The expected further decline in the hypothetical EMSP force structure is the reason the Committee also has declined to authorize the suggested EMSP multiyear procurement.

The Navy is directed to select signal processors that meet its requirements, are economical, and low risk.

To implement its decision, the Committee recommends the following program element adjustments:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
LAMPS.....	30,215	34,215	20,290	-9,925	-13,925
Airborne ASW developments.....	25,843		8,310	-17,533	+8,310
Navy standard signal processors.....	9,266	9,266		-9,266	-9,266
Submarine combat system.....	270,272	220,272	242,972	-27,300	+22,700
Undersea surveillance systems.....	72,594	42,594	68,894	-3,700	+26,300

ADDITIONAL ADJUSTMENTS

Contractor travel.—The Committee recommends reducing the Navy's RDT&E budget request by \$20,899,000 due to expected savings from increased contractor use of discount air fares. Further rationale is presented in the principal Committee observations section of this chapter. The House allowance does not make such a reduction.

Submarine sonar development.—The Committee recommends \$39,494,000, a reduction of \$2,000,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$14,494,000 above the House allowance. The adjustment is possible due to a delay in the contract award for the on-board trainer.

Defense research sciences; other technology base university grants.—As explained in the principal Committee observations section, the Committee recommends \$380,382,000, a reduction of \$15,385,000, to the budget request and an amount \$12,385,000 below the House allowance, for Navy defense research sciences. This program element supports basic research in subjects of broad military interest. A reduction of \$9,779,000 also is recommended in funds requested for university grants in the exploratory and advanced development program elements.

These reductions are associated with savings due to expected changes in the allowable overhead rate charges on university research grants and from more effective cost negotiating by the Defense Department with university practitioners. The Senate recommendation for defense research sciences is \$12,385,000 below the House allowance, which also made no reduction in the exploratory and advanced development university grants.

Aircraft propulsion.—This program element funds development of critical aircraft engine technologies. The Committee agrees with the House allowance of \$3,000,000, a reduction to the budget request of \$4,542,000. The Navy stated the funds denied would prototype critical technologies for engines for the F/A-18E/F and AX aircraft, for the advanced tactical fighter [ATF] F-119 engine, and for the F-100 and F-110 engines. These projects should be funded in the Aircraft Engine Component Improvement Program program element or the specific aircraft development program elements for the ATF, F/A-18E/F, or AX.

Advanced aircraft subsystems.—The Committee recommends \$3,000,000, a decrease of \$3,004,000 to the budget request and the same amount as the House allowance, to this program element to develop advanced aircraft avionics. Funds are denied for activities which should be funded in the F/A-18E/F or AX aircraft development programs.

In addition, the Committee rejects the Navy's claim that funds are required to continue the service's participation in the Joint Integrated Avionics Working Group [JIAWG]. This working group exists to coordinate the avionics policies and standards of the armed services. As such, the group undertakes no research and development activities. The Committee, therefore, believes no funds are required for service membership and representation, and the Navy is directed to continue its full participation.

Electromagnetic radiation source elimination technology.—This program element develops technologies to increase Navy capabilities to defeat adversary radars and radar-guided weapons. The Committee deletes the \$5,091,000 sought for these efforts, since the program was restructured after the budget request was submitted. The new program primarily duplicates other Navy and Air Force activities to develop new air-to-air and air-to-surface missiles and defense suppression weapons. The House allowance contains \$3,000,000 for this program element.

Airborne mine countermeasures—engineering development; Marine Corps advanced technology demonstrations.—The funds affected by the Committee's recommendations are associated with efforts to develop laser technologies to improve Navy and Marine Corps capabilities to neutralize mines in both deep and shallow waters.

The Committee recommends accelerating development of a less costly near-term system, known as Magic Lantern, and to defer a technologically risky, more expensive effort to develop a system which would not be available until after the year 2000, at the earliest. To implement its recommendation, the Committee adds \$14,000,000 to the budget request for the airborne mine countermeasures program element and deletes \$16,828,000 from the Marine Corps advanced technology demonstrations program element. The recommendation is \$14,000,000 above the House allowance in the former program element and \$19,828,000 below the House allowance in the latter.

The Committee notes that development of Magic Lantern, a helicopter-borne system is well underway due to the addition to the program of \$9,200,000 contained in the first Desert Storm supplemental funding measure. The Committee believes that Magic Lantern has the potential to meet Navy and Marine Corps needs 5 to 10 years earlier than the alternative airborne system, which it is deferring.

In the Committee's opinion, development of two laser-based systems is not affordable in this period of extreme fiscal constraints. Any justification for a long-term system should be reviewed during the fiscal year 1993 budget cycle. By that time, results should be available from an ongoing Navy/Marine Corps effort to establish definite mine warfare priorities and programs. The Committee also recognizes that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency is developing an alternative to the long-term laser system using different technologies in an unmanned underwater vehicle configured for shallow water mine countermeasures.

Mine countermeasures initiative fund.—The Committee provides a \$20,500,000 addition to the budget request to expand the Navy's RDT&E on mine countermeasures [MCM]. Funds are provided for the following activities: a remote operated mine countermeasures air cushioned craft, sweep system improvements, portable degaussing range, enhancements to the AN/SLQ-48 system, an expendable neutralizer, non-MCM ships remote minehunting capability, and study support.

The Committee directs that none of the funds provided may be used to develop/procure unmanned aerial vehicles [UAV]. This function, if justified for MCM purposes, should be undertaken by

the Joint Remotely Piloted Vehicles Program under the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The Committee warns the Navy not to contribute to proliferation of noncommon UAV's under the guise of addressing mine warfare deficiencies.

The House allowance does not include these additional funds.

The Committee further understands that the Navy and Marine Corps are attempting to reconcile their mine warfare priorities during a comprehensive review of all mine warfare programs and policies. The Committee urges expeditious completion of that effort and directs that a full report be submitted with the next budget request outlining the decisions, programs, policies and budget profiles in fiscal years 1993-98 resulting from this review.

Advanced technology transition.—The Committee recommends \$60,082,000, a reduction to the budget request of \$5,071,000 for this program element which funds near-term, systems-oriented demonstrations of technologies in many naval warfare areas. The recommendation deletes \$2,771,000 available due to poor financial and program execution in the current fiscal year and denies \$2,300,000 for a new start in multimission propulsion which would develop a pulse rocket motor. This effort is premature and redundant to ongoing Navy programs, such as the supersonic low altitude target [SLAT] and the advanced air-to-air missile [AAAM], which are developing advanced propulsion technologies.

The House allowance approved the budget request.

Trident II.—The Committee recommends \$18,303,000, a reduction of \$43,300,000 to the budget request and \$58,300,000 below the House allowance, to this program element which develops improvements to the Trident II submarine-launched ballistic missile. Funds are denied for the submarine-launched ballistic missile effectiveness enhancement [SEE] effort, since the Trident II missile is a brand new missile which began deployment only 2 years ago and already possesses the accuracy and payload combination to meet mission requirements across the entire target spectrum. The Committee believes performance enhancements are premature and unnecessary at this time.

Fleet ballistic missile system.—This program element funds efforts to maintain the effectiveness of the Trident I and Poseidon submarine-launched ballistic missiles. The Committee deletes \$7,000,000 from the budget request of \$14,812,000. The denied funds were sought in the vulnerability and effectiveness project for conceptual studies to identify responses to near-term threats to Trident I missile effectiveness. The Navy has stated there are no weaknesses in the Trident I missile system to any near-term threats which would require research and development on missile modifications. Thus, the requested funds are unneeded. The House allowance made no changes to the budget request.

Acoustic search sensors; air antisubmarine warfare [ASW].—The Committee recommends \$27,108,000, a decrease of \$23,953,000 to the budget request and an amount \$2,953,000 below the House allowance for the acoustic search sensors program element. The Committee provides \$8,531,000, a reduction of \$1,300,000 to the budget request and the same amount as the House allowance, to the air antisubmarine warfare program element.

In the acoustic search sensors program element, the Committee agrees with the House allowance to deny \$21,000,000 and terminate the tactical surveillance sonobuoy [TSS] project. TSS was designed to counter a diminishing, deep-water threat, and future Navy budgets contain no funds for production or deployment. The recommendation also deletes \$1,503,000 from the program element since the Navy identified this amount as unneeded for remaining efforts, and \$1,450,000 due to delay in start of full-scale development for the air deployed active receiver.

The air ASW reduction agrees with the House allowance to eliminate \$1,300,000 requested for an enhanced tactical surveillance sonobuoy project which the Navy has canceled.

Submarine arctic warfare support equipment program.—This program is misnamed and has nothing to do with developing arctic warfare equipment. It is associated with enhancing electronic warfare support capabilities for submarines. The Committee approves \$2,151,000, an amount which is \$3,000,000 below the budget request and \$1,849,000 below the House allowance.

The recommendation deletes studies to define a future electronic warfare support measures [ESM] system for retrofit into the new SSN-21 attack submarine or any follow-on attack submarine. These studies are premature since the SSN-21 program has been delayed and the first boat will not go to sea before fiscal year 1996, and since the Navy has yet to begin establishing an overall design concept for any new attack boat. Also, a firm operational requirement does not exist for any new attack submarine ESM system.

Nonacoustic antisubmarine warfare [NAASW].—The Committee approves \$13,800,000 for the Navy's program to develop technologies not using sound waves to detect and attack adversary submarines. This amount is \$12,397,000 below the budget request, but \$13,800,000 above the House allowance.

The Committee recommendation maintains the Navy's NAASW program at the fiscal year 1991 funding level. The remaining requested funds are transferred to the "Defense agencies, RDT&E" account to partly finance a \$30,000,000 increase to continue the Office of the Secretary of Defense's [OSD] independent nonacoustic ASW program. Report language in the Defense agencies RDT&E section will direct OSD to fully fund ATD Project 111 at the amount included for that activity in the fiscal year 1992 budget request.

Ship development; ship contract design/development (engineering).—These program elements finance the Navy's early study and design activities for new surface platforms. The Committee recommends \$5,000,000, a reduction of \$12,267,000 to the budget request and the same amount as the House allowance, for the ship development program element. The Committee approves \$22,200,000, a reduction of \$10,627,000 to the budget request and \$5,173,000 above the House allowance, for the ship contract design/development (engineering) program element.

In the ship development program, the Committee denies \$5,500,000 for preliminary design of a new amphibious ship, L(X). This effort is premature until Congress evaluates in the next budget review the overall affordability of the program and the results of a feasibility study due later this year. Also denied is

\$300,000 sought to begin a feasibility study on a new repair ship, A(X), which is a lower priority in view of budget constraints. The recommendation deletes \$6,467,000 of \$11,467,000 proposed for ship design methods, plans, and concept studies, in recognition of their lower priority and to reduce requested steep growth in the project.

The recommendation for ship contract design/development (engineering) eliminates \$5,000,000 for more detailed design work for L(X). This activity also is premature for the above-mentioned reasons. Also deleted is \$2,127,000 sought for designing the new CVN-76 aircraft carrier. OSD believes the ship will repeat previous nuclear aircraft carrier designs. The Committee approves \$3,500,000 of \$7,000,000 requested to design a minehunter variant, the MHC(V).

The Committee has denied full funding for the MHC(V) for two reasons. First, the Navy has not completed new feasibility studies for this mine countermeasures ship. Second, the Committee believes there exist significant problems with the management of mine countermeasure programs as evidenced by the extraordinary delays in getting assets to the fleets.

The Committee intends that the funds provided be used to design a future mine warfare ship class. The Committee expects the Navy to compare the MHC(V) concept with other possible alternatives before proceeding with a specific design.

Electric drive.—This program element develops advanced machinery, propulsion systems, and electric power equipment for surface ships and submarines. The budget request for this program contains 67 percent real growth compared to current fiscal year funds.

This program is presented as a high priority within the Navy. However, the service has not committed to deploy the technology and systems on any of its future ships. The stated program objective is a vague goal of being ready for ship installation when an unspecific opportunity is identified. The Committee believes this logic does not support the requested level of program growth in the current budget environment.

In addition, a substantial amount of the effort in the current program is devoted to the intercooled regenerative [ICR] gas turbine engine, ship screw and blade development, and other efforts which are useful in a conventional or electric drive ship. Thus, the Navy's commitment to the program element does not necessarily reflect a commitment to electric drive technologies.

For all these reasons, the Committee recommends \$53,799,000, a reduction of \$27,107,000 to the budget request, but an amount which funds the ICR engine and other significant technology efforts. The Committee also notes that the current electric drive program is estimated to cost more than \$600,000,000 during the fiscal years 1992-97 future years defense program. This cost estimate clearly establishes this program as a substantial acquisition category program which should be subject to milestone reviews and independent cost estimates.

The Committee directs the Navy to designate the program as an acquisition category program. The Committee also expects that, if the Navy truly is committed to electric drive technologies, it should identify in the fiscal year 1993 budget request a specific platform in

the long-term ship building program which will be constructed as an electric drive ship.

The House allowance denied all funds requested for this program element.

MK-48 advanced capability [ADCAP]—advanced development.—The Committee recommends \$14,927,000, a decrease of \$37,700,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$11,700,000 below the House allowance, for this program element to develop enhancements to the Navy's Mark 48 ADCAP heavy torpedo. Funds requested for the closed cycle ADCAP propulsion system are denied since the program has failed to meet performance requirements and cannot be made to do so given the current state of technology, according to the Navy. The Navy is considering alternatives to the current activity.

Support equipment.—The Committee approves \$10,000,000, a reduction of \$9,718,000 to the budget request and the same amount below the House allowance, for this program element which supports the consolidated automated support system [CASS]. CASS is a system of computers and video displays integrated into an automated test set to provide fault-detection and repair diagnoses for many Navy weapons.

The recommendation defers fiscal year 1992 funds for a new initiative the Navy began last year without prior approval of Congress and without proper identification of the activity in the budget justification material. The new effort develops a missile test station [MTS] adjunct to the basic CASS equipment.

The MTS project already is 6 to 9 months behind schedule. Therefore, the Committee has deleted the fiscal year 1992 funds in the expectation that current fiscal year funds are sufficient to finance work at a modest level while Congress evaluates the entire rationale for MTS in the fiscal year 1993 budget review.

The Committee also warns the Navy that it will not tolerate the initiation of new projects out of the regular budget cycle or the diversion of funds away from projects for which they were appropriated without prior congressional approval.

Ocean engineering technology developments.—The Committee recommends \$15,546,000, an increase of \$2,000,000 to the budget request and an equal amount below the House allowance for this program element. The added funds will initiate a competitive, 36-month project to develop larger, advanced ceramic cylinders for use in unmanned underwater vehicles. Total cost of the project is estimated at \$4,000,000, and the Committee's action fully funds the first year of the effort.

P-3 modernization.—This program element funds projects to enhance the capabilities of the P-3 antisubmarine warfare, land-based patrol aircraft. The Committee provides \$51,044,000, an addition of \$9,900,000 to the budget request, but an amount which is \$7,703,000 below the House allowance.

The Committee agrees with the House recommendation to add \$41,700,000 to the budget request to begin an engine upgrade program for the P-3 due to cancellation of the follow-on P-7 aircraft development effort. Also, the Committee deletes \$31,800,000 to terminate the Update IV avionics upgrade due to long delays, 100 percent cost growth, a large anticipated contractor claim, and lack of

any funds in future Navy budgets for production or for retrofitting the system into current aircraft.

The Committee has been informed that the Navy is considering more affordable, less risky options to Update IV as it defines the full configuration for the new ORION II program to modernize existing P-3's in lieu of the P-7 program.

The Navy is directed to provide with the fiscal year 1993 budget request a detailed plan for any justified P-3 modernization. The plan should include total and future years defense program costs, a detailed schedule, and cost-effectiveness assessment. Furthermore, the Navy is directed to fully fund continuation of the P-3C engine upgrade program in its fiscal years 1993-98 budget request and spending plan.

CH-46E upgrades.—The Committee adds \$50,000,000 to the budget request to initiate a program to upgrade the Marine Corps' medium-lift helicopter fleet consistent with Committee action in the "Procurement" account to restart CH-46E production. The Committee believes that the enhancements to be considered should include advanced avionics, improved reliability and maintainability, and increased fuel capacity. The House allowance does not include this increase.

Electronic warfare [EW] development.—This program element funds many projects to develop or improve electronic warfare systems for Navy ships and Navy/Marine Corps aircraft. The Committee approves a total of \$110,140,000, a decrease of \$32,143,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$30,140,000 above the House allowance. The recommendation decreases the budget request as follows:

One, deletes \$3,929,000 for the new start advanced integrated electronic warfare system [AIEWS]; AIEWS lacks a firm operational requirement and firm program/acquisition plan.

Two, deletes \$3,014,000 for the new start offboard active countermeasure decoy, which lacks a firm operational requirement and settled acquisition plan; the project is to develop an EW payload for current and future unmanned aerial vehicles [UAV] under development.

The effort is premature since the joint UAV program is just beginning efforts to define and develop maritime UAV's. Thus, the weight, payload, and electronics requirements for any EW payload are uncertain.

Three, deletes \$16,000,000 for a preplanned product improvement program [P³I] for the advanced self-protection jammer [ASPJ]. This activity is premature since ASPJ has not yet completed early operational tests to verify if the baseline system has corrected previous deficiencies and is a firm basis for any improvement effort. In addition, the procurement program is underfunded in the future years defense program, and the feasibility of one component of the P³I project will not be assessed until later this year.

Four, deletes \$1,000,000 to develop infrared decoys. This endeavor could duplicate work already underway by Air Force; the Navy is directed to join that service in a joint development project.

Five, deletes \$1,400,000 for an optical countermeasures activity. The Committee directs the Navy to join in a codevelopment pro-

gram in fiscal year 1993 with the other services under the leadership of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

Six, deletes \$6,800,000 from the fiscal year 1992 request which can be replaced by an equal amount of current fiscal year funds available due to a Navy decision not to develop a new aircraft for the fleet electronic warfare support groups [FEWSG].

Close-in weapon system [CIWS/Phalanx].—The Committee recommends \$9,297,000, a reduction of \$1,300,000 to the budget request and the same amount below the House allowance. This program element develops improvements to the close-in weapon system for surface ship terminal defenses.

Initiation of block II upgrades for CIWS for \$5,300,000 is deferred because the Navy is rethinking the entire program due to affordability concerns and limits on expected effectiveness in face of current and future threats. The recommendation fully funds continued block I CIWS upgrades and adds \$4,000,000 to enhance these upgrades.

Air control.—The Federal Aviation Administration [FAA] is in the process of upgrading the Nation's air traffic control system through the national airspace system [NAS] program. The Committee is concerned that the Navy's efforts and those of the FAA are on incompatible schedules. Under the budget request, the Navy could develop unique air traffic control equipment which is more costly and not compatible with the equipment being developed by the FAA. The Air Force, which operates the majority of the service's land-based air traffic control centers, is proceeding at a much slower pace to take full advantage of the FAA's efforts. Therefore, the Committee recommends \$6,959,000, a reduction of \$3,603,000 to the Navy budget request and an equal amount below the House allowance, and directs that no fiscal year 1992 funds may be used to develop equipment which is incompatible with, or duplicates, items being developed in the FAA NAS program.

Combat information center conversion.—This program develops block 1 computers and software upgrades as part of the advanced combat direction system program, under the Navy tactical data systems software improvements project. Due to technical problems, the Navy divided the scope of work into baseline and options, including increment 1.

The Committee recommends deleting funds for the increment 1 option in fiscal year 1992 as it is premature, since the Navy is considering alternatives to it and a reduction in program requirements. The contractor has not demonstrated that technical problems with the baseline program have been solved, and the Navy will not evaluate program technical status until November 1991. In addition, test ship availability may be delayed, which reduces the need to maintain the current increment 1 schedule.

The Committee approves \$16,133,000, a reduction of \$3,000,000 to the budget request. The House allowance eliminated all funds for this program element.

Bomb fuze improvement.—The Committee deletes all funds, which is a reduction of \$24,533,000 to the budget request and an equal amount below the House allowance for this program element to develop the advanced bomb family [ABF]. The recommendation defers full-scale development of the ABF, since the Navy is re-

thinking the entire technical approach, inventory requirements, commonality prospects with Air Force, and program structure in the wake of Desert Storm.

The Committee understands the Navy may choose to modify current systems in a quick reaction program to obtain hard target penetrator bombs. Also, firm definition of the Navy's bomb improvement program technology and inventory requirements will not be available for Congress to assess until at least next year in the fiscal year 1993 budget review.

Surface antisubmarine warfare [ASW] system improvement.—The Committee approves \$63,024,000, a reduction of \$58,700,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$700,000 below the House allowance. The recommendation denies \$58,700,000 sought for the AN/SQY-1 surface antisubmarine warfare program. The Committee directs the Navy to use the recommended funds to finance improvements to the current AN/SQQ-89 ASW system or to continue the SQY-1 program 30 days after Congress has been notified of the future costs and benefits of the Navy's preferred alternative.

The Navy is reconsidering its acquisition strategy for upgrading surface ship ASW capabilities due to concerns about the affordability of the SQY-1, which has a \$13,000,000,000 life cycle cost. The Navy already is assessing less costly alternatives to improve the existing AN/SQQ-89 systems. The Committee also understands the SQY-1 system is a lower priority to Navy, which recommended reallocating as much as \$75,000,000 in fiscal year 1991 funds away from the program to finance other, higher priority activities.

The House terminated the AN/SQY-1 but added funds for enhanced modular signal processor activities which the Committee rejects due to its position that EMSP also should be terminated as unaffordable and unnecessary.

Fixed distributed system [FDS]—engineering.—The Committee recommends \$243,223,000, an increase of \$14,069,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$54,069,000 above the House allowance for this program element. The recommendation deletes \$5,931,000 of funds which will not be obligated until fiscal year 1993 and adds \$20,000,000 to accelerate development of an advanced deployable array system. The Navy is directed to assess the cost effectiveness of several concepts and alternatives for such a system before using the added funds.

F/A-18 squadrons.—The Navy's attempts in the past year to chart an affordable, militarily justified, and cost-effective course for the future of naval aviation have, in the Committee's opinion, not yielded the intended result. In the wake of the demise of the A-12 attack aircraft and F-14D remanufacturing programs, the Navy has proposed two new, major, and costly modernization efforts—the AX aircraft and the F/A-18E/F programs.

The AX program, intended to develop a less costly successor to the A-12 and an ultimate replacement for the aging A-6E, all-weather, medium-attack fleet, is nevertheless expected to cost at least \$14,000,000,000. The F/A-18E/F upgrade is projected to cost at least \$4,000,000,000. It is intended to provide the Navy with a complement and successor to the Navy's primary air-to-air combat platform, the F-14, as well as to supplement the carrier's offensive ground attack capabilities.

The Committee believes it is premature to assess the overall affordability of the AX aircraft, since the specific mix of combat capabilities and airframe performance parameters is largely undefined. For example, the concept exploration phase of the AX program will begin and extend through fiscal 1992, as competing industry design teams formulate their specific proposals to meet the Navy's broad set of tentative operational requirements.

Indeed, the degree to which the AX can perform both air-to-air, as well as air-to-ground, missions, is an important consideration being defined during the next year. According to the Secretary of Defense, the AX is expected to possess a significant air-to-air and air-to-ground capability for both offensive and defensive purposes. In a decade of declining defense budgets and changing threats, the Committee thinks this is a prudent conclusion. The affordability and military utility of primarily single-mission aircraft under these conditions is very much in doubt.

Thus, based on the Defense Secretary's statement, and the designs expected to be proposed by some of the industry teams, the Committee concludes that the AX actually has the potential to fulfill some of the air-to-air mission of the proposed F/A-18 aircraft.

The Committee's fiscal year 1992 recommendation with respect to the F/A-18 program is heavily influenced by the potential for the multirole capability for the AX, and the need to review the results of the concept exploration phase of the program to establish the extent to which this potential will be fulfilled.

While the F/A-18 E/F variant is proposed to cure long-standing Navy dissatisfaction with the range and payload capabilities of current F-18's, a principal justification for the program is to provide growth room for further improvements beyond the F/A-18C/D and beyond the basic E/F. The core of the E/F program is to provide the fuselage weight, space, and power to permit further extensive and expensive upgrades to the E/F shortly after the basic E/F configuration is fielded.

The costs of developing and procuring these additional capabilities are not included in the \$4,000,000,000 cost so far projected for the F/A-18E/F. The true costs of the F/A-18E/F program are unknown and the ability of future defense budgets to support such upgrades is uncertain. Indeed, these costs are not included even in the later years of the Navy FYDP, which is underfunded just for planned upgrades to the F/A-18 C/D's.

The Committee is uncertain what advantage lies in spending \$4,000,000,000 during the next 5 years just to field an aircraft we immediately will have to spend further untold millions or billions to improve. Based on the Defense Secretary's projection and the expected contractor designs, the extent to which the F/A-18 needs to be upgraded is very hypothetical. The more the AX is capable of air-to-air combat and supersonic speeds, the more simply producing additional F/A-18C/D's is an acceptable, affordable alternative to an open-ended, costly E/F program.

Furthermore, the high cost and steep increase in F/A-18E/F funding profiles is driven by an arbitrary initial operational capability [IOC] date and large contract termination-liability requirements. The Navy has failed to justify both the IOC urgency and the termination liability financial requirements.

The Committee notes the Navy has inflated the weight projection used to claim that the F/A-18 C/D will lose too much payload in the future—thus necessitating the E/F.

Also, a major question exists with respect to the survivability improvements claimed for the E/F compared with the C/D. In the Committee's opinion, these claims should be subject to more independent review before they can be accepted with sufficient confidence to help justify a \$4,000,000,000 program. Further elaboration on this issue is contained in the classified annex to the Committee's report.

Finally, the Committee observes that in making claims about the affordability of the E/F, the Navy compares the costs of the aircraft with the more expensive F-14. The service does not consider any economies from forgoing the E/F altogether, procuring multi-mission AX in larger quantities, and purchasing more F/A-18 C/D's in the near term to address hypothetical inventory shortfalls. The Committee thinks these considerations should be assessed and notes the unit cost of an E/F will not be inexpensive, especially when further upgrades are considered.

Taking into account all these considerations, the Committee believes it is prudent to moderate the proposed pace of the F/A-18E/F program to prevent premature commitment to a costly program which may not be necessary, and which may not deliver as advertised. This moderation also will reduce the financial burden on the Navy budget and permit further assessment of the AX and F/A-18 programs as better, more complete information becomes available. The Committee's course of action permits more time to resolve these issues and preserves Congress' options and the taxpayers' pocketbook without risking national security.

For all these reasons, it is recommended that \$319,077,000 be appropriated for all F/A-18 research and development efforts in fiscal year 1992. This amount includes \$250,000,000 for the F/A-18E/F, a reduction of \$133,000,000 from the budget request and \$153,000,000 from the House allowance, but an amount still representing 2,908-percent growth (excluding inflation) from the program's fiscal year 1991 funding. This amount is more than sufficient to maintain program momentum in this difficult budget environment.

The Committee makes this reduction without prejudice and believes that the \$250,000,000 provided demonstrates full support for maintaining Congress' option to pursue a vigorous and robust F/A-18E/F development program in the future.

To assist the Congress in evaluating the full benefits and costs of the F/A-18E/F program, additional information is needed. Therefore, the Committee directs the Office of the Secretary of Defense to submit the following information, no later than April 15, 1992:

- An updated cost estimate for the program, including a full listing of all the upgrades contemplated for the F/A-18E/F, the total cost, and costs between fiscal years 1992 and 1998 to develop, procure, and install each upgrade, the timetable for such acquisition and installation, and whether each upgrade project is fully funded in these years.
- An updated projection by the U.S. intelligence community validating in detail, by region, scenario, and potential adversary,

the most likely and realistic air-to-air and surface-to-air threats the F/A-18 E/F would face in the years 1998-2010, and the specific validated threat capabilities which each particular F/A-18E/F upgrade project is intended to counter.

- An independent assessment of the capabilities of each F/A-18E/F upgrade to counter each specific threat.
- A new cost and operational effectiveness analysis by an independent organization in no way connected with the Navy, assessing the cost and operational effectiveness of the E/F with the F/A-18C/D's configured as they are programmed to be by fiscal year 1996, and with the emerging designs for the AX.
- An independent assessment by the Air Force's civilian and military experts of the proposed survivability features of the E/F and their likely effectiveness against the expected threats and their resistance to countermeasures.

For the purposes of conducting the independent survivability analysis, the Committee directs that the Air Force military and civilian experts, including those at Lincoln Laboratory, be provided access and clearances for all information they deem necessary.

Ship-towed array surveillance systems.—The Committee recommends \$27,622,000, an increase of \$10,000,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$21,000,000 above the House allowance for this program element. The increase is provided to convert the *Amy Chouest* oceanographic ship for expanded antisubmarine warfare experiments. This conversion will include installing a low-frequency active array.

Special projects.—The Committee recommends \$14,477,000, a reduction of \$3,900,000 to the budget request and an equal amount below the House allowance, for developing instrumentation to support fleet training. The budget request for this program includes \$7,700,000 to develop the tactical combat training system [TCTS], a fiscal year 1992 new start to develop equipment which will allow the Navy to conduct realistic training exercises at sea by putting instrumentation on the participating ships and aircraft. The Navy stated that \$3,600,000 will be used to define TCTS and \$3,900,000 will be used to demonstrate TCTS concepts. The Committee recommendation denies the \$3,900,000 requested to demonstrate TCTS system concepts. Demonstration of system concepts prior to defining the system is premature and may lead the Navy to select an approach which is not compatible with current simulation initiatives in the DOD. To ensure TCTS is compatible with future simulation systems, the Committee directs the Navy to design TCTS using the standard simulation architecture and data format, the protocol data unit [PDU], developed by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA]. The Committee directed use of this simulation standard in a similar Army program.

The Committee is aware of a Navy proposal to develop a new in-port training system, the battle force tactical training [BFTT] system, to replace a system which is currently being upgraded, the battle force in-port training [BFIT] system. The Committee expects the Navy to fully validate the requirement to develop two separate training systems in support of any requested fiscal year 1993 funds.

Electronic warfare simulator development.—The Committee recommendation denies \$5,100,000 requested for the Echo subproject

because fiscal year 1992 plans to develop a digital electronic warfare simulator were deferred. The Committee recommends the Navy further defer these efforts until an Office of the Secretary of Defense [OSD] effort in the Central Test and Evaluation Improvement Program [CTEIP] to develop a standard electronic warfare digital simulation architecture is complete. The Committee recommendation of \$26,204,000 is \$10,900,000 above the House allowance.

Target systems development.—This program element includes a subproject to develop the supersonic low-altitude target [SLAT]. The SLAT will be used to test the capabilities of the AEGIS, close-in weapon system [CIWS], and the standard missile—2. As a result of recent flight test failures in the program, the Navy restructured the SLAT program and revised the fiscal year 1992 budget request to \$51,000,000 from \$72,900,000. The restructured program includes funds to complete engineering development and to purchase 15 test targets to provide an earlier initial operational capability. The Committee is aware that nine SLAT vehicles already are available for ground and flight testing once all development issues are resolved. The Committee recommendation provides \$34,712,000 for the SLAT subproject within this program element to fund development and testing of the system, a reduction of \$38,269,000 to the budget request for this subproject. The recommendation denies funds to procure any additional targets and accelerate the initial operational capability of a system with an uncertain future. The recommendation provides \$61,268,000 for this program element, a reduction of \$38,269,000 to the budget request. The House allowance is \$33,731,000 below the Committee recommendation.

The Committee is very concerned about the high program cost of the SLAT vehicle, estimated at \$4,500,000 per target. The cost of procuring and operating SLAT depends heavily on the undemonstrated capability to recover, refurbish, and reuse a SLAT vehicle. In addition, refurbishment costs are currently estimated to be over \$400,000. The Committee directs the Navy to conduct a thorough analysis of the target capabilities necessary to test Navy weapon systems, including a review of the existing and projected threats. The report also should: identify all alternatives to SLAT, including any existing lower speed targets or targets available from NATO or other allied countries; clearly define all costs associated with the alternative targets; and discuss the penalties and benefits of using alternative systems. The Committee directs that none of the fiscal year 1992 funds may be obligated or expended until 30 days after the Committee receives a report on the SLAT program containing the previously required information.

Multisensor integration/quick reaction combat capability.—The Committee approves an increase of \$23,000,000 to the budget request to accelerate near-term improvements to existing surface ship antiair warfare defenses under a quick reaction combat capability [QRCC] program. The QRCC will provide for integrated operation and control of existing shipboard sensors, weapons, and fire control system displays and decision aids.

The Committee directs that none of the funds may be used for any efforts related to the far-term short-range antiair warfare [SRAAW] program, including transition activities and technology development. The SRAAW effort is a costly and unfunded program

which lacks firm definition and a validated operational requirement.

The House allowance does not include this initiative.

RDT&E ship and aircraft support.—The Committee recommends \$101,341,000, and directs that \$15,000,000 of the funds are available only for completing the modifications of the *Knorr* and *Melville* oceanographic ships. The House cut \$10,341,000 to constrain growth and added \$15,000,000 for the *Knorr* and *Melville*.

Industrial preparedness.—The Committee concurs with the Senate-passed authorization bill to transfer \$20,302,000 of the Navy's manufacturing technology funds to a consolidated program under the auspices of the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The action retains \$5,000,000 in the Navy program element, an amount which is \$95,002,000 below the House allowance. Report language in the Defense Agencies RDT&E section will earmark \$3,000,000 for ongoing efforts to develop manufacturing technologies for fabrication of submarine propulsors, design and manufacturing of lightweight ship structures, and repair of aircraft carrier valves and catapult launch systems. The \$5,000,000 in remaining funds are provided for continued development of educational materials and courses which will be used to enhance the skills of the defense acquisition work force. The courses provide a better awareness of weapon system design, test, and production with emphasis on managing technical risk and improving efficiency.

Centurion/new attack submarine.—The Committee recommends an increase of \$50,000,000 to the budget request to begin concept studies, designs, technology development, and cost and operational effectiveness analyses for a new design nuclear attack submarine to be a less costly alternative to SSN-21 *Seawolf* class boats. The House allowance does not include this increase. The Committee strongly supports the Navy's effort to assess the prospects for acquisition of a more affordable nuclear attack submarine [SSN] as the successor to the SSN-21 *Seawolf* class vessels.

The Committee would be concerned if the Navy prematurely focuses this project on a single SSN design concept with a relatively narrowly defined size, level of technology, and cost. Given the profound uncertainty about the future international security environment, focusing the Centurion project now on a single design concept may yield an SSN design that could prove inappropriate for the military and budgetary environment of the late 1990's and beyond.

The Committee also believes that Navy planning and schedules for the new SSN must consider any impacts on the nuclear-powered submarine industrial base.

Therefore, the Committee directs the Navy to develop a variety of general design concepts over the next year in its Centurion project. The concepts should range in size from 5,000 tons to 9,000 tons submerged displacement, and in level of technology from existing *Seawolf*-level technology to more advanced, post-*Seawolf* and Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency developed technologies.

The Committee thinks that at least some of the design concepts based on existing SSN-21 technologies should be developed with early procurement availability as a primary objective. These design

concepts should aim for lead-boat full funding no later than fiscal year 1998.

The Committee intends to follow closely these design efforts and to understand fully the tradeoffs in capabilities, cost, technical risks, and shipbuilding schedules. Accordingly, the Navy is directed to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the full range of its SSN design concepts in unclassified and classified form no later than April 15, 1992.

This report should describe and compare the various SSN design concepts in terms of: (1) size; (2) level of technology; (3) capabilities; (4) estimated RDT&E and shipbuilding costs; (5) technical risks; (6) year of lead-boat full funding; (7) relationship to a range of realistic and likely Soviet and non-Soviet military threats of the late 1990's and beyond; and (8) potential impact on the nuclear-powered submarine industrial base.

Sea launch and recovery [SEALAR] project.—The Committee understands that a potential exists for a joint government-industry program to develop lower cost SEALAR space boosters as an alternative or complement to more expensive Air Force rockets. The Committee encourages the continued formulation of this project, subject to OSD review and approval, but believes it is premature at this time to allocate additional funds for such an effort.

The Committee is reluctant to embark on an expensive and unbudgeted development effort, even under a cost-sharing arrangement, until the project's military requirement and technological and economic feasibility are firmly established. This feasibility will not be determined until after already-budgeted fiscal year 1992 efforts are complete.

Last year the Committee added funds to accelerate SEALAR and to fully fund the unfunded, second year of a 3-year effort to demonstrate recovery and reusability of the SEALAR booster through suborbital tests, and to prove technical basis for the economic projections for this approach. The already-budgeted fiscal year 1992 funds will complete this SEALAR increment 1, which will help Congress assess whether to continue with the more expensive increments of the project.

The Committee approves these requested funds and directs the Office of the Secretary of Defense to report back to Congress as soon as possible on: (1) whether there is a military requirement for SEALAR and whether there is an approved list of satellites which definitely would be manifested if SEALAR is available; (2) whether SEALAR is affordable, cost effective, and an acceptable alternative to current and future Air Force boosters; and (3) the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed cooperative development program, including total costs to develop, procure, and launch any SEALAR boosters.

Submarine laser communications.—The Committee is aware of proposals to develop laser technologies for communicating with submarines. It is claimed that these technologies have the potential for improving submarine communications in three principal ways: (a) reducing current reliance on towed buoy receivers; (b) enhancing the data rate and certainty of communications connectivity to strategic missile submarines; and (c) increasing tactical antisubmarine warfare coordination for attack boats.

It is further asserted that technology has progressed to the point where a satellite-based laser system might be feasible, and that architecture concepts are being drafted which may have some operational validity.

The Committee also is aware of claims that certain elements in the Navy may be more interested than previously in developing laser-based submarine communications systems.

The Committee observes that such contentions have been made periodically for the past 12 years, and that Congress has appropriated about \$200,000,000 during this interval to develop these technologies and encourage the Navy to embrace submarine laser communications systems. Despite this investment, the Navy has demonstrated a particular disinterest in budgeting for such efforts or for ever fielding such a system. Indeed, on occasion, the Navy has strenuously resisted such programs.

This history and the current budget constraints argue convincingly against providing fiscal year 1992 funds for submarine laser communications activities, as some have suggested.

The Committee believes that, if the Navy is serious about such systems, it will fully fund an acquisition program in the fiscal years 1993-98 future years defense program. Should the Navy include such funding, the Committee expects that next year's budget request will provide a full analysis of the operational utility of these systems, including a detailed discussion of the above mentioned improvements. Such an analysis also should assess the full costs and technological risks to acquire and deploy such systems.

Tactical nuclear development.—The Committee has been informed the Navy intends to reinstitute development of the B-90 nuclear depth/strike bomb in the fiscal years 1994-98 future years defense program, despite Committee action to terminate the program last year by deleting all project funds.

The Committee notes that both the Senate authorizing committee and the Senate Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee have recommended denial of fiscal year 1992 funds sought for the weapon's warhead production facilities. It is the Committee's understanding that the Energy and Water Subcommittee's intention was to terminate the program. In addition, the conference report on the fiscal year Energy Department funding measure upheld the Senate initiative.

The Committee restates its position that the B-90 program should be terminated. The Defense Department is directed to cease all activities associated with restarting B-90, including obligation and expenditure of any funds to store assets of the canceled program. The Navy is directed to dispose of these unnecessary assets.

A-6 squadrons.—The Committee is aware of a proposal to begin a project to upgrade the radar of the A-6E all-weather, medium-attack aircraft. The project's cost effectiveness, affordability, and priority within the Navy are uncertain. The Committee observes the project is not even a top priority of the naval aviation attack community.

Nevertheless, the A-6E is expected to be retained in the Navy's inventory for a longer time period due to the termination of the A-12 program. The Committee thinks it is prudent for the Navy to update its assessment of the cost effectiveness, affordability, and

priority of various proposals to enhance the A-6E, including the upgrade. The Navy is directed to report to the Congress on these matters during the fiscal year 1993 budget review.

Shipboard system component development.—The Committee has fully funded the budget request for this program element which includes funds for developing and testing fiber optic-based voice, video and data networks onboard ships. The Navy is currently spending millions of dollars to improve current copper cables and develop procedures for mitigating the smoke and other problems caused by the current cables in the event of a fire in a ship compartment. Fiber optic cables carry more information in a smaller diameter cable. Thus, fewer cables are necessary to meet all the future information exchange needs on board the ship, and redundant networks can be developed while the space required for cables is reduced. The redundant design and reduced volume will significantly improve a ship's survivability while decreasing weight aboard the ship. Still, the Navy has not committed to deploy fiber optic technology and systems on any of its future ships. The Committee urges the Navy to accelerate development of fiber optic technology and recommends the Navy plan to deploy fiber optic information networks on future ships.

Marine Corps assault vehicles.—The Marine Corps has requested \$67,884,000 to continue the design and development of the advanced amphibious assault [AAA] vehicle, a successor to the current amphibian, the AAV-7A1.

In order to reduce areas of potential cost and technical risk, the Office of the Secretary of Defense [OSD] has directed a restructuring of the Marine AAA development program. The Marine Corps original development concept was to award two cost plus fixed fee type contracts in fiscal year 1992 for the concept demonstration/validation phase. At the direction of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Marine Corps will now delay the award of the demonstration/validation contract until fiscal year 1993 and only award a contract to one prime contractor. The Committee supports this risk reduction effort and further concurs with the need for retaining ongoing competitive engine development activities.

As a result of this program restructuring, the Marine Corps has informed the Committee that the fiscal year 1992 budget request is overstated by \$38,000,000. The Committee recommends reducing these excess funds.

Improved medium tactical vehicle program.—It has come to the attention of the Committee that the Marine Corps may begin a service life extension program [SLEP] for its overage 5-ton tactical trucks in fiscal year 1992. The Marine Corps has named this program the Improved Medium Tactical Vehicle Program [IMTVP].

The Committee is quite concerned that the Marine Corps has not justified to Congress the rationale for IMTVP nor have they fully budgeted for this 5-ton SLEP program. The Committee also notes that the Congress has established cost guidelines for the Army's SLEP which state that a remanufactured truck cannot cost more than one-third the cost of a new truck.

The Committee directs that, prior to proceeding with the Improved Medium Tactical Vehicle Program, the Marine Corps shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations and authorization a

report outlining the justification and full funding profile for this program. The Committee will hold the Marine Corps to the same cost ratio standards for their truck remanufacture program as have been imposed on the Army.

Marine Corps airborne early warning [AEW] aircraft.—The Committee has been informed about the possibility that Marine Corps KC-130T aircraft might be adapted to provide airborne early warning capabilities useful in the counternarcotics mission. The Office of the Secretary of Defense is directed to assess and report to Congress on the cost effectiveness and operational effectiveness of integrating onto Marine Corps KC-130T aircraft the APS 145 group II weapons system carried by the Navy's E-2C AEW aircraft.

This assessment also should report whether there exists a validated military requirement and a definite counternarcotics requirement for such an adaptation. If such requirements exist, the Secretary of the Navy is directed to identify offsets in the Marine Corps aviation budget which are lower priority and could be deferred to finance such an integration program.

Marine Corps ground combat/supporting arms systems.—The Marine Corps has included \$20,489,000 for the continued development of the light armored vehicle—air defense [LAV-AD] system in fiscal year 1992. The Committee provides \$27,789,000 for this activity in fiscal year 1992, an increase of \$7,300,000 above the budget request and \$2,900,000 above the House allowance.

The LAV-AD program has recently successfully completed developmental testing and the Marine Corps has informed the Committee that they intend to select a contractor before operational testing begins. In order to make this early contractor selection and to add several improvements to the air defense variant, the Marine Corps will require additional funding in fiscal year 1992. The Committee provides \$7,300,000 in additional funds in fiscal year 1992 to accelerate the LAV-AD program schedule and to provide funding for a possible replacement for the hydra-70 rocket and for new night sights.

The Committee expects that any additional improvements, such as the hydra rocket replacement, shall be accomplished without imposing any delays in the LAV-AD development program. Any testing and development of the improvements should be done in parallel with the operational testing and not interrupt the current schedule to begin procurement in fiscal year 1993.

Test and evaluation support.—The Committee recommends \$342,091,000, the requested funding and an amount \$62,091,000 above the House allowance for this program element. The Committee directs that \$13,200,000 of the funds are available only for acquisition of Global Positioning System Range Applications Joint Program Office instrumentation.

House actions agreed to.—The Committee agrees with the following recommendations contained in the House allowance:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Over-the-horizon targeting	2,974			- 2,974	
Advanced minor caliber gun		2,500	2,500	+ 2,500	
Surface ship technology	17,006	32,006	32,006	+ 15,000	

House actions not agreed to.—The Committee disagrees with the following recommendations contained in the House allowance:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Strategic technical support	7,422	4,000	7,422		+ 3,422
Integrated aircraft avionics	25,158	7,000	25,158		+ 18,158
Submarine support equipment program	18,901		18,901		+ 18,901
F-14 upgrade	116,281	136,281	116,281		- 20,000
Technical information services	2,741		2,741		+ 2,741
Warfare systems architecture/engineering	7,365		7,365		+ 7,365
Management/technical support	12,286		12,286		+ 12,286
Aircraft engine component improvement program	58,856	40,000	58,856		+ 18,856
Operational test and evaluation capability	8,038	6,538	8,038		+ 1,500
RDT&E instrumentation and material support	18,123	10,123	18,123		+ 8,000
Aircraft technology	23,776	15,000	23,776		+ 8,776
Command, control, and communications technology	19,617	10,000	19,617		+ 9,617
Systems support technology	80,521	57,000	80,521		+ 23,521
Mission support technology	37,017	20,000	37,017		+ 17,017
Electronic warfare technology	13,975	10,000	13,975		+ 3,975
Nuclear propulsion	15,282	12,000	15,282		+ 3,282
Ocean and atmospheric support technology	39,724	44,724	39,724		- 5,000
Independent exploratory development	15,803		15,803		+ 15,803
EW technology	4,916		4,916		+ 4,916
Ship propulsion system	4,536		4,536		+ 4,536
Manpower and personnel systems	3,245	1,000	3,245		+ 2,245
Generic logistics R&D technology demonstrations	13,829	21,329	13,829		- 7,500
Education and training	6,106	2,000	6,106		+ 4,106
Simulation and training devices	5,177	3,000	5,177		+ 2,177
Advanced antisubmarine warfare technology	42,939	16,000	42,939		+ 26,939
C ³ advanced technology	1,373		1,373		+ 1,373
Tactical space operations	4,181	1,608	4,181		+ 2,573
SSN-21 developments	157,441	127,441	157,441		+ 30,000
SSBN survivability	17,570	8,000	17,570		+ 9,570
WWMCCS architecture support	997		997		+ 997
SSBN security technology program	53,270	44,000	53,270		+ 9,270
Submarine acoustic warfare development	37,216	32,000	37,216		+ 5,216
Trident	39,863	25,000	39,863		+ 14,863
Navy strategic communications	29,935	20,000	29,935		+ 9,935
Air/ocean tactical applications	7,936	7,400	7,936		+ 536
T-45 training system	6,477		6,477		+ 6,477
Air crew systems technology	10,386	15,386	10,386		- 5,000
Navy advanced tactical fighter		50,000			- 50,000
Tactical airborne reconnaissance	15,574	21,774	15,574		- 6,200
Aircraft survivability and vulnerability	12,943	8,000	12,943		+ 4,943
Advanced surface-to-air missile	34,760	20,000	34,760		+ 14,760
Low cost antiradiation seeker		4,000			- 4,000
Advanced air-to-air missile [AAAM]	89,331		89,331		+ 89,331
Battle group AAW coordination	11,152		11,152		+ 11,152

[in thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Advanced submarine ASW development.....	31,232	36,000	31,232		-4,768
Shipboard aviation systems.....	11,440		11,440		+11,440
Shipboard system component development.....	28,039	10,000	28,039		+18,039
Ship combat survivability.....	25,589	10,000	25,589		+15,589
Advanced ASW target.....	17,102	5,000	17,102		+12,102
Surface ASW.....	7,236	47,000	67,236		+20,236
Advanced submarine system development.....	35,621	25,000	35,621		+10,621
Advanced nuclear power systems.....	89,884	70,000	89,884		+19,884
Joint advanced systems.....	177,170		177,170		+177,170
Advanced warhead development.....	6,640	5,000	6,640		+1,640
Tactical nuclear development.....	6,426		6,426		+6,426
Marine Corps ground combat/support system.....	9,319	23,319	9,319		-14,000
ASW oceanography.....	9,894	5,000	9,894		+4,984
ASW signal processing.....	27,812	20,000	27,812		+7,812
Fleet Tactical Development and Evaluation Program.....	6,144		6,144		+6,144
Command and control systems.....	8,160		8,160		+8,160
Container off-loading and transfer system [COTS].....	1,003		1,003		+1,003
Navy Energy Program.....	4,714		4,714		+4,714
Facilities improvement.....	466		466		+466
Link Hazel.....	11,547	1,547	11,547		+10,000
Retract elm.....	149,847	109,847	149,847		+40,000
Antisubmarine warfare environmental acoustic support..	18,372	17,500	18,372		+872
IFF system development.....	22,343	32,343	22,343		-10,000
Air/ocean equipment engineering.....	2,806		2,806		+2,806
Air crew systems development.....	17,318	21,518	17,318		-4,200
MK-92 fire control system upgrade.....	2,012		2,012		+2,012
Sea lance.....		20,000			-20,000
Advanced medium range air-to-air missile.....	2,693	12,693	2,693		-10,000
Standard missile improvements.....	36,821	20,000	36,821		+16,821
Tomahawk.....	28,815	32,815	28,815		-4,000
5-inch rolling airframe missile.....		5,000			-5,000
New threat upgrade.....	9,977		9,977		+9,977
Ship survivability.....	5,048		5,048		+5,048
Naval gunnery improvements.....	4,513		4,513		+4,513
Unguided conventional air-launched weapons.....	8,389	2,400	8,389		+5,989
Marine Corps assault vehicles—Eng dev.....	19,104	23,004	19,104		-3,900
Antisubmarine warfare oceanographic equipment.....	1,260		1,260		+1,260
Navy Energy Program.....	3,389	1,000	3,389		+2,389
Surface warfare training devices.....	10,711		10,711		+10,711
Joint standoff weapon systems.....	53,447		53,447		+53,447
C-3 surveillance/reconnaissance support.....	15,769	10,769	15,769		+5,000
Early warning aircraft squadrons.....	6,349		6,349		+6,349
Fleet telecommunications (tactical).....	18,682	8,682	18,682		+10,000
ASW combat systems integration.....	19,367	15,367	19,367		+4,000
Operational reactor development.....	58,593	40,593	58,593		+18,000
Marine Corps intelligence/electronics warfare systems...	28,305	55,405	28,305		-27,100
Range instrumentation systems development.....	9,836		9,836		+9,836
Personnel, training, simulation, and human factors.....	1,794		1,794		+1,794
Studies and analysis support—Navy.....	6,297		6,297		+6,297
Marine Corps operations analysis group, CNA.....	4,157	4,549	4,157		-392
Center for Naval Analyses.....	24,321	26,196	24,321		-1,875
Fleet tactical development and evaluation.....	12,721		12,721		+12,721
RDTE laboratory and facilities management support....	58,343	40,000	58,343		+18,343
Laboratory fleet support.....	6,512		6,512		+6,512
DBOF adjustment.....		-59,200			+59,200
Historical deobligations.....		-60,000			+60,000

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Budget estimate	House allowance
				Senate compared with--	
RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL NAVY					
TECHNOLOGY BASE					
IN-HOUSE INDEPENDENT LABORATORY RESEARCH.....	25,868	10,000	17,500	-8,368	+7,500
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES.....	395,767	392,767	380,382	-15,385	-12,385
OTHER TECH BASE UNIVERSITY GRANTS.....	---	---	-9,779	-9,779	-9,779
ANTI-AIR WARFARE/ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE TECHNOLOGY.....	70,517	50,000	68,281	-2,236	+18,281
SURFACE SHIP TECHNOLOGY.....	17,006	32,006	32,006	+15,000	---
AIRCRAFT TECHNOLOGY.....	23,776	15,000	23,776	---	---
MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY.....	18,036	18,036	18,036	---	+8,776
COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY.....	19,617	10,000	19,617	---	+9,617
MISSION SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY.....	37,017	20,000	37,017	---	+17,017
MATERIALS.....	---	---	---	---	---
SYSTEMS SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY.....	80,521	57,000	80,521	---	+23,521
ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY.....	13,975	10,000	13,975	---	+3,975
ASW TECHNOLOGY.....	130,902	130,902	129,257	-1,645	-1,645
TACTICAL OCEANOGRAPHY TECHNOLOGY.....	---	---	---	---	---
MINE AND SPECIAL WARFARE TECHNOLOGY.....	20,549	20,549	20,549	---	---
SUBMARINE TECHNOLOGY.....	17,813	17,813	17,813	---	---
NUCLEAR PROPULSION.....	15,282	12,000	15,282	---	+3,282
OCEAN AND ATMOSPHERIC SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY.....	39,724	44,724	39,724	---	-5,000
INDEPENDENT EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT.....	15,803	---	15,803	---	+15,803
PRECOMPETITIVE TECHNOLOGY.....	---	---	---	---	---
TOTAL, TECHNOLOGY BASE.....	942,173	840,797	919,760	-22,413	+78,963

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Senate compared with--	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT					
AIRCRAFT PROPULSION.....	7,542	3,000	3,000	-4,542	---
ADVANCED AIRCRAFT SUBSYSTEMS.....	6,004	3,000	3,000	-3,004	---
EW TECHNOLOGY.....	4,916	---	4,916	---	+4,916
ELECTROMAGNETIC RADIATION SOURCE ELIMINATION TECHNOLOG	5,091	3,000	---	-5,091	-3,000
SHIP PROPULSION SYSTEM.....	4,536	---	4,536	---	+4,536
ELECTRIC DRIVE.....	---	---	---	---	---
MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)...	32,815	35,815	15,987	-16,828	-19,828
HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING.....	2,868	2,868	2,868	---	---
MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT.....	16,222	37,222	37,222	+21,000	---
MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL SYSTEMS.....	3,245	1,000	3,245	---	+2,245
GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS.....	13,829	21,329	13,829	---	-7,500
EDUCATION AND TRAINING.....	6,106	2,000	6,106	---	+4,106
MARINE CORPS ADVANCED MANPOWER/TRAINING SYSTEMS.....	3,294	3,294	3,294	---	---
SIMULATION AND TRAINING DEVICES.....	5,177	3,000	5,177	---	+2,177
ADVANCED ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TECHNOLOGY.....	42,939	16,000	42,939	---	+26,939
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION.....	65,153	65,153	55,682	-9,471	-9,471
C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	1,373	---	1,373	---	+1,373
ADVANCED SPECIAL OPERATIONS RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND.	---	---	---	---	---
TOTAL, ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	221,110	196,681	203,174	-17,936	+6,493
STRATEGIC PROGRAMS					
TACTICAL SPACE OPERATIONS.....	4,181	1,608	4,181	---	+2,573
SSBN SURVIVABILITY.....	17,570	8,000	17,570	---	+9,570
NAVMCS ARCHITECTURE SUPPORT.....	997	---	997	---	+997

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Senate compared with--	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
TRIDENT II.....	61,603	76,603	18,303	-43,300	-58,300
STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT.....	7,422	4,000	7,422	---	+3,422
SEALAR.....	---	---	---	---	---
FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM.....	14,812	14,812	7,812	-7,000	-7,000
SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.....	53,270	44,000	53,270	---	+9,270
SUBMARINE ACUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT.....	37,216	32,000	37,216	---	+5,216
TRIDENT.....	39,863	25,000	39,863	---	+14,863
EXTREMELY LOW FREQUENCY (ELF) COMMUNICATIONS.....	537	537	537	---	---
NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS.....	29,935	20,000	29,935	---	+9,935
NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE.....	805	805	805	---	---
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (ME)	2,365	2,365	2,365	---	---
WORLD-WIDE MILITARY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS, INFOR	4,435	4,435	4,435	---	---
TOTAL, STRATEGIC PROGRAMS.....	275,011	234,165	224,711	-50,300	-9,454
=====					
TACTICAL PROGRAMS					
INTEGRATED AIRCRAFT AVIONICS.....	25,158	7,000	25,158	---	+18,158
AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS.....	7,936	7,400	7,936	---	+536
T-45 TRAINING SYSTEM.....	6,477	---	6,477	---	+6,477
AIR CREW SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY.....	10,386	15,386	10,386	---	-5,000
SKIPPER ENHANCEMENTS.....	---	---	---	---	---
CV ASW MODULE.....	3,967	3,967	3,967	---	---
NAVY ADVANCED TACTICAL FIGHTER.....	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000
A-X.....	---	---	---	---	---
AIR ASW.....	9,831	8,531	8,531	-1,300	---
AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES.....	9,602	9,602	9,602	---	---
TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE.....	15,574	21,774	15,574	---	-6,200

[In thousands of dollars]

	Senate compared with--			
	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Budget estimate
				House allowance
AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY AND VULNERABILITY.....	12,943	8,000	12,943	+4,943
ADVANCED A/L AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM.....	---	---	---	---
ADVANCED SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE.....	34,760	20,000	34,760	+14,760
NATO AAW SYSTEMS.....	---	---	---	---
LOW COST ANTI-RADIATION SEEKER.....	---	4,000	---	-4,000
ADVANCED AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AAAM).....	89,331	---	89,331	+89,331
BATTLE GROUP AAW COORDINATION.....	11,152	---	11,152	+11,152
SURFACE MINE COUNTERMEASURES.....	18,472	18,472	18,472	---
MINE COUNTERMEASURES INITIATIVE FUND.....	---	---	---	---
ADVANCED SUBMARINE ASW DEVELOPMENT.....	31,232	36,000	31,232	-4,768
SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE.....	58,388	58,388	58,388	---
SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS.....	11,440	---	11,440	+11,440
SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT.....	28,039	10,000	28,039	+18,039
SHIP COMBAT SURVIVABILITY.....	25,589	10,000	25,589	+15,589
SUBMARINE ARCTIC WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROGRAM.....	5,151	4,000	2,151	-1,849
PILLOT FISH.....	57,710	57,710	57,710	---
NON-ACOUSTIC ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE (ASW).....	26,197	---	13,800	+13,800
ADVANCED ASW TARGET.....	17,102	5,000	17,102	+12,102
RETRACT JUNIPER.....	50,656	50,656	50,656	---
RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL.....	2,876	2,876	2,876	---
LINK SAKI.....	24,859	---	---	-24,859
SURFACE ASW.....	67,236	47,000	67,236	+20,236
ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT.....	35,621	25,000	35,621	+10,621
SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS.....	7,013	7,013	7,013	---
SHIP DEVELOPMENT.....	17,267	5,000	5,000	-12,267
FAST SEALIFT TECHNOLOGY.....	---	---	---	---
MINE COUNTERMEASURES SUPPORT SHIP DESIGN.....	---	---	---	---
ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS.....	89,884	70,000	89,884	+19,884
ELECTRIC DRIVE.....	80,906	---	53,799	+53,799

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate compared with--
CHALK EAGLE.....	142,607	142,607	142,607	---	---	---
COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION.....	9,730	9,730	9,730	---	---	---
JOINT ADVANCED SYSTEMS.....	177,170	---	177,170	---	---	+177,170
MINE DEVELOPMENT.....	8,874	8,874	8,874	---	---	---
CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS.....	43,168	43,168	43,168	---	---	---
ADVANCED WARHEAD DEVELOPMENT.....	6,640	5,000	6,640	---	---	+1,640
MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES.....	79,908	79,908	41,908	-38,000	---	-38,000
MARINE CORPS MINE/COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ADV DEV.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
MINE COUNTERMEASURES INITIATIVE FUND.....	---	---	20,500	+20,500	---	+20,500
TACTICAL NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENT.....	6,426	---	6,426	---	---	+6,426
MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	9,319	23,319	9,319	---	---	-14,000
JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT.....	8,531	8,531	8,531	---	---	---
ADVANCED MINOR CALIBER GUN.....	---	2,500	2,500	+2,500	---	---
MK 48 ADCAP - ADV DEV.....	52,627	26,627	14,927	-37,700	---	-11,700
OCEAN ENGINEERING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	1,652	1,652	1,652	---	---	---
ASW OCEANOGRAPHY.....	9,894	5,000	9,894	---	---	+4,894
ASW SIGNAL PROCESSING.....	27,812	20,000	27,812	---	---	+7,812
ADVANCED MARINE BIOLOGICAL SYSTEM.....	1,868	1,868	1,868	---	---	---
FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION PROGRAM.....	6,144	---	6,144	---	---	+6,144
OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENTS.....	13,546	17,546	15,546	+2,000	---	-2,000
COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS.....	8,160	---	8,160	---	---	+8,160
CONTAINER OFF-LOADING AND TRANSFER SYSTEM (COTS).....	1,003	---	1,003	---	---	+1,003
NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM.....	4,714	---	4,714	---	---	+4,714
FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT.....	466	---	466	---	---	+466
MERCHANT SHIP NAVAL AUGMENTATION PROGRAM.....	1,886	1,886	1,886	---	---	---
MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
CHALK CORAL.....	67,115	67,115	67,115	---	---	---
LINK HAZEL.....	11,547	1,547	11,547	---	---	+10,000
LINK LAUREL.....	49,199	49,199	49,199	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Senate compared with--	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
RETRACT MAPLE.....	216,173	416,173	250,673	+34,500	-165,500
LINK PLUMERIA.....	20,851	20,851	20,851	---	---
CHALK WEED.....	1,362	1,362	1,362	---	---
RETRACT ELM.....	149,847	109,847	149,847	---	+40,000
CHALK POINSETTIA.....	1,616	1,616	1,616	---	---
WARFARE SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING.....	7,365	7,365	7,365	---	+7,365
ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE ENVIRONMENTAL ACOUSTIC SUPPORT.....	18,372	17,500	18,372	---	+872
SPECIAL PROCESSES.....	58,277	58,277	58,277	---	---
GUN WEAPON SYSTEM ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	5,134	5,134	---	-5,134	-5,134
SHIP FIRE SUPPORT.....	---	---	---	---	---
STANDARD AVIONICS DEVELOPMENT.....	11,572	11,572	11,572	---	---
IFF SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT.....	22,343	32,343	22,343	---	-10,000
LAMPS.....	30,215	34,215	20,290	-9,925	-13,925
HELICOPTER DEVELOPMENT.....	63,121	11,621	11,621	-51,500	---
AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV.....	9,486	9,486	9,486	---	---
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	19,718	10,000	10,000	-9,718	---
AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING.....	2,806	---	2,806	---	+2,806
AIRBORNE ASW DEVELOPMENTS.....	25,843	---	8,310	-17,533	+8,310
P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM.....	41,144	58,747	51,044	+9,900	-7,703
ADVANCED TACTICAL AIRCRAFT.....	---	---	---	---	---
C/NH-53E.....	9,305	9,305	9,305	---	---
CH-46E UPGRADES.....	---	---	50,000	+50,000	+50,000
ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS.....	51,061	30,061	27,108	-23,953	-2,953
V-22A.....	---	625,000	165,000	+165,000	-460,000
V-22 PRIOR YEAR.....	---	---	-165,000	-165,000	-165,000
AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	17,318	21,518	17,318	-7,531	-4,200
AIR LAUNCHED SATURATION SYSTEM.....	7,531	---	---	---	---
AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	58,856	40,000	58,856	---	+18,856
EW DEVELOPMENT.....	142,283	80,000	110,140	-32,143	+30,140
SURFACE SHIP ELECTRONIC WARFARE.....	---	---	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Senate compared with--	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
HK 92 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM UPGRADE.....	2,012	---	2,012	---	+2,012
MULTI-SENSOR INTEGRATION.....	---	---	---	---	---
AEGIS AREA AIR DEFENSE.....	7,902	7,902	7,902	---	---
AEGIS COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING.....	92,153	92,153	91,465	-688	-688
SEA LANCE.....	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE.....	2,693	12,693	2,693	---	-10,000
AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING.....	---	---	---	---	---
VERTICAL LAUNCH JSROC.....	36,933	36,933	---	-36,933	-36,933
ASW STANDOFF WEAPON.....	---	---	20,000	+20,000	+20,000
CLOSE-IN WEAPON SYSTEM (PHALANX).....	10,597	10,597	9,297	-1,300	-1,300
NATO SEA SPARROW.....	6,234	6,234	6,234	---	---
STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS.....	36,821	20,000	36,821	---	+16,821
TOMAHAWK.....	28,815	32,815	28,815	---	-4,000
5"ROLLING AIR FRAME MISSILE.....	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
SSN-688 CLASS VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEM.....	---	---	---	---	---
NEW THREAT UPGRADE.....	9,977	---	9,977	---	+9,977
AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES - ENG DEV.....	---	14,000	14,000	+14,000	---
SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS.....	14,033	14,033	14,033	---	---
SUBMARINE SONAR DEVELOPMENT.....	41,494	25,000	39,494	-2,000	+14,494
AIR CONTROL.....	10,562	10,562	6,959	-3,603	-3,603
CHEMICAL WARFARE COUNTERMEASURES.....	5,597	5,597	5,597	---	---
NAVY STANDARD SIGNAL PROCESSORS.....	9,266	9,266	---	-9,266	-9,266
RADAR SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT.....	8,043	8,043	8,043	---	---
SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROGRAM.....	18,901	---	18,901	---	+18,901
SHIP SURVIVABILITY.....	5,048	---	5,048	---	+5,048
COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION.....	19,133	---	16,133	-3,000	+16,133
SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEM.....	270,272	220,272	242,972	-27,300	+22,700
DEEP SUBMERGENCE TECHNOLOGY.....	27,284	---	23,434	-3,850	+23,434
SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS.....	157,441	127,441	157,441	---	+30,000
CENTURION.....	---	---	50,000	+50,000	+50,000

[In thousands of dollars]

	Senate compared with--			
	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Budget estimate
SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM.....	79,208	79,208	79,208	---
SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/DEVELOPMENT (ENG).....	32,827	17,027	22,200	-10,627
NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES.....	36,567	36,567	36,567	---
MARK BIRCH.....	---	---	---	---
MINE DEVELOPMENT.....	8,963	8,963	8,963	---
NAVAL GUNNERY IMPROVEMENTS.....	4,513	---	4,513	---
UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS.....	8,389	2,400	8,389	---
CHEMICAL WARFARE WEAPONS.....	---	---	---	---
SURFACE ELECTRO-OPTIC SYSTEM.....	---	---	---	---
SURFACE SHIP LASER RANGE FINDER.....	---	---	---	---
SURFACE SHIP INFRARED SENSOR.....	---	---	---	---
BOMB FUZE IMPROVEMENT.....	24,533	24,533	---	-24,533
MK 50 TORPEDO.....	2,002	2,002	2,002	---
MARINE CORPS MINE COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ENG DEV....	1,183	1,183	1,183	---
JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT.....	5,679	5,679	5,679	---
MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES - ENG DEV.....	19,104	23,004	19,104	-3,900
MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEM - EN	---	---	---	---
ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE OCEANOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT.....	1,260	---	1,260	+1,260
OVER-THE-HORIZON TARGETING.....	2,974	---	---	-2,974
NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM.....	3,389	1,000	3,389	+2,389
SURFACE ASM SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT.....	121,724	63,724	63,024	-58,700
AIR WARFARE TRAINING DEVICES.....	832	832	832	---
SURFACE WARFARE TRAINING DEVICES.....	10,711	---	10,711	+10,711
MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT.....	107	107	107	---
MARINE CORPS INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONICS WARFARE SYSTEM..	370	370	370	---
MARINE CORPS COMMAND/CONTROL/COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS...	17,181	17,181	17,181	---
JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS.....	53,447	---	53,447	+53,447
INTELLIGENCE.....	2,026	2,026	2,026	---
MEDICAL DEVELOPMENTS.....	4,160	4,160	4,160	---
JINTACCS MARINE CORPS.....	788	788	788	---

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate compared with--
FIXED DISTRIBUTED SYSTEM - ENG.....	229,154	189,154	243,223	+14,069	+54,069	---
FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
ELECTROMAGNETIC SPECTRUM MANAGEMENT.....	3,658	3,658	3,658	---	---	---
MANAGEMENT AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
C2 SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT.....	15,769	10,769	15,769	---	+5,000	---
A-6 SQUADRONS.....	6,423	6,423	6,423	---	---	---
F/A-18 SQUADRONS.....	452,077	472,077	319,077	-133,000	-153,000	---
EARLY WARNING AIRCRAFT SQUADRONS.....	6,349	---	6,349	---	+6,349	---
SEA-BASED ELECTRONIC WARFARE SQUADRONS.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL).....	18,682	8,682	18,682	---	+10,000	---
SURFACE COMBATANT ORDNANCE AND MISSILES.....	28,428	20,428	27,228	-1,200	+6,800	---
UNDERSEA SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS.....	72,594	42,594	68,894	-3,700	+26,300	---
SHIP-TOWED ARRAY SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS.....	17,622	6,622	27,622	+10,000	+21,000	---
AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT)	3,400	3,400	3,400	---	---	---
SPECIAL PROJECTS.....	18,377	18,377	14,477	-3,900	-3,900	---
HARM IMPROVEMENT.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
TACTICAL INFORMATION SYSTEM.....	73,658	73,658	73,658	---	---	---
ASW COMBAT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION.....	19,367	15,367	19,367	---	+4,000	---
AIRCRAFT EQUIPMENT RELIABILITY/MAINTAINABILITY PROGRAM	---	---	---	---	---	---
LABORATORY FLEET SUPPORT.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
F-14 UPGRADE.....	116,281	136,281	116,281	---	-20,000	---
TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE PROCESSING.....	2,109	2,109	2,109	---	---	---
OPERATIONAL REACTOR DEVELOPMENT.....	58,593	40,593	58,593	---	+18,000	---
MARINE CORPS TELECOMMUNICATIONS.....	3,833	3,833	3,833	---	---	---
MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS.....	20,489	24,889	27,789	+7,300	+2,900	---
MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT.....	205	205	205	---	---	---
MARINE CORPS INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONICS WARFARE SYSTEMS.....	28,305	55,405	28,305	---	-27,100	---
MARINE CORPS COMMAND/CONTROL/COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS.....	18,835	18,835	18,835	---	---	---
TACIT RAINBOW.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC).....	673	673	673	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Senate compared with--	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
FEWSG AIRCRAFT COMPETITION.....	---	---	---	---	---
IMPROVED TACTICAL AIR LAUNCHED DECOY.....	---	---	---	---	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	---	---	---	---	---
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO OSD COUNTERNARCOTICS.....	---	---	---	---	---
MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM.....	---	---	---	---	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAM.....	---	---	---	---	---
FORCE ENHANCEMENTS-ACTIVE.....	---	---	---	---	---
MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM.....	---	---	12,000	+12,000	+12,000
MULTI-SENSOR INTEGRATION/QRCC.....	---	---	23,000	+23,000	+23,000
TOTAL, TACTICAL PROGRAMS.....	5,112,389	4,806,807	4,741,517	-370,872	-65,290
INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS					
WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	2,521	2,521	2,521	---	---
TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM.....	33,977	33,977	33,977	---	---
NAVIGATION SYSTEMS.....	4,132	4,132	4,132	---	---
EHF SATCOM.....	33,686	33,686	33,686	---	---
NAVSTAR GPS.....	50,504	50,504	50,504	---	---
NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT.....	3,082	3,082	3,082	---	---
SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS.....	31,122	31,122	31,122	---	---
MILSTAR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM.....	3,534	3,534	3,534	---	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	678,821	692,636	693,621	+14,800	+985
TOTAL, INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS.....	841,379	855,194	856,179	+14,800	+985
DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT					
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.....	26,143	26,143	26,143	---	---
RANGE INSTRUMENTATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (RISD).....	9,836	---	9,836	---	+9,836

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate compared with--
ELECTRONIC WARFARE SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT.....	31,304	15,304	26,204	-5,100	+10,900	
TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	99,537	27,537	61,268	-38,269	+33,731	
PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS.....	1,794	---	1,794	---	+1,794	
STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - MC.....	2,170	2,170	2,170	---	---	
STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY.....	6,297	---	6,297	---	+6,297	
MARINE CORPS OPERATIONS ANALYSIS GROUP, CNA.....	4,157	4,549	4,157	---	-392	
CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES.....	24,321	26,196	24,321	---	-1,875	
FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION.....	12,721	---	12,721	---	+12,721	
MARINE CORPS OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION.....	5,000	5,000	5,000	---	---	
SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH.....	---	---	---	---	---	
TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES.....	2,741	---	2,741	---	+2,741	
MANAGEMENT AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT.....	12,286	---	12,286	---	+12,286	
INTERNATIONAL RDT&E.....	3,210	---	2,210	-1,000	+2,210	
RDT&E LABORATORY AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT SUPPORT.....	58,343	40,000	58,343	---	+18,343	
RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION AND MATERIEL SUPPORT.....	18,123	10,123	18,123	---	+8,000	
RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT.....	86,341	91,000	101,341	+15,000	+10,341	
TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT.....	342,091	280,000	342,091	---	+62,091	
OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY.....	8,038	6,538	8,038	---	+1,500	
MARINE CORPS TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABIL PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS.....	1,153	1,153	1,153	---	---	
LABORATORY FLEET SUPPORT.....	534	534	534	---	---	
WEATHER SERVICE.....	6,512	---	6,512	---	+6,512	
DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (DMSP).....	1,122	1,122	1,122	---	---	
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS.....	13,095	13,095	13,095	---	---	
USN/USMC MINE WARFARE.....	25,302	100,002	5,000	-20,302	-95,002	
TEST RANGES BASE OPERATIONS/RPMA.....	---	---	---	---	---	
NAVY LABORATORIES OVERHEAD.....	---	---	---	---	---	
CONTRACTOR TRAVEL.....	---	---	---	---	---	
TOTAL, DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT.....	802,171	650,466	731,601	-20,899	-20,899	
				-70,570	+81,135	

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Senate compared with--	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
RESCISION TO BE DETERMINED.....	---	---	---	---	---
DBOF ADJUSTMENT.....	---	-59,200	-19,600	-19,600	+39,600
DBOF TECHNICAL CORRECTION: DTIC.....	---	---	6,100	+6,100	+6,100
DBOF TECHNICAL CORRECTION: IACS.....	---	---	2,700	+2,700	+2,700
HISTORICAL DEOBLIGATIONS.....	---	-60,000	---	---	+60,000
UNCDISTRIBUTED INCREASE.....	---	---	---	---	---
BUDGET AMENDMENT CORRECTION.....	-851,600	---	---	+851,600	---
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL NAVY.....	7,342,633	7,464,910	7,666,142	+323,509	+201,232

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

Appropriations, 1991	\$11,961,310,000
Budget estimate, 1992	15,032,600,000
House allowance	14,263,941,000
Committee recommendation	14,123,675,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$14,123,675,000 for the Air Force's research, development, test, and evaluation programs, a decrease of \$908,925,000 to the budget request. The recommendation is \$140,266,000 below the House allowance.

SUMMARY TABLE

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Change from budget
Technology base	855,787	814,876	-40,911
Advanced technology development	818,384	529,599	-288,785
Strategic programs	4,532,134	4,271,717	-260,417
Tactical programs	4,747,782	4,840,633	+92,851
Intelligence and communications	2,439,587	2,299,197	-140,400
Defensewide mission support	1,638,916	1,358,553	-280,363

The budget activities and programs funded under this appropriation are discussed below.

CLASSIFIED PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to classified programs, as explained in the classified annex to the Committee's report:

(In thousands of dollars)

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Strategic programs	360,715	441,715	316,715	-44,000	-125,000
Tactical programs	977,309	735,639	1,202,509	+225,200	+466,870
Intelligence and communications programs	2,333,744	2,221,733	2,175,244	-158,500	-46,489

The Committee agrees with the House allowance to reduce \$10,000,000 for unjustified 100-percent growth requested for premature activities. The Committee also recommends deleting \$10,000,000 identified by the Air Force as unneeded in the advanced systems improvement program element to study a follow-on for the terminated Tacit Rainbow Program. Additional adjustments are explained in the classified annex to the Committee report.

OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request to concur, or partially concur, with the Senate-passed defense authorization legislation:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Aerospace vehicle technology.....	22,858	22,858	12,058	-10,800	-10,800
Advanced fighter technology integration.....	24,073	24,073	10,173	-13,900	-13,900
Defense business operations fund [DBOF] technical corrections:					
DTIC.....			6,300	+6,300	+6,300
IACS.....			2,800	+2,800	+2,800

ADJUSTMENTS DUE TO POOR FINANCIAL EXECUTION IN FISCAL YEAR 1991

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to eliminate funds not expected to be spent in fiscal year 1992, due to slow obligation, execution, and expenditure of fiscal year 1991 funds:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Distant early warning [DEW] radar stations.....	2,862	2,862	2,223	-639	-639
National airspace system [NAS] plan.....	4,687	2,687	3,256	-1,431	+569

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

The fiscal year 1992 budget request included many programs which contain: (a) excessive growth; (b) lower priority or premature efforts; (c) activities duplicating those in the other services; (d) funds identified by the Air Force or Office of the Secretary of Defense as excess to known fiscal year 1992 program requirements; (e) projects canceled by the Air Force after the budget request was submitted; and (f) funds associated with management support and RDT&E overhead functions.

In expectation of the significant contraction of the defense research and development infrastructure due to likely budget constraints, the Committee recommends funding many of these program elements at the fiscal year 1991 level or lower. Any funds identified as excess to known program requirements are eliminated. The Committee recommends the following adjustments:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
In-house lab independent research.....	9,972	7,972	8,283	-1,689	+311
Aerospace flight dynamics.....	71,656	68,356	65,055	-6,601	-3,301
Aerospace avionics.....	83,086	73,086	80,290	-2,796	+7,204

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Advanced weapons.....	38,450	38,450	37,605	— 845	— 845
Aerospace propulsion subsystems integration.....	30,295	30,295	28,720	— 1,575	— 1,575
International activities.....	3,970	2,970	2,970	— 1,000	
Air base operability advanced dev.....	3,375	3,375		— 3,375	— 3,375
Test and evaluation support.....	402,330	371,330	371,330	— 31,000	

SPACE-BASED WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE PROGRAMS

The Committee deletes funds for Air Force space-based wide area surveillance [SBWAS] efforts for reasons explained in the principal Committee observations section of this chapter. The remaining funds in the space surveillance technology program element are provided only for development of the Have Gaze technology.

Reductions beyond the amounts requested for SBWAS projects in some of the program elements reflect additional decreases to constrain spending for low-priority, institutional support, or discretionary research efforts in view of overall budget limits. Specific adjustments are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Geophysics.....	40,441	38,541	39,052	— 1,389	+ 511
Materials.....	69,235	66,135	68,235	— 1,000	+ 2,100
Aerospace propulsion.....	69,355	72,355	68,055	— 1,300	— 4,300
Rocket propulsion/astronautics tech.....	47,341	37,341	43,050	— 4,291	+ 5,709
Command, control, communications.....	88,665	88,665	82,206	— 6,459	— 6,459
Space surveillance tech.....	25,100	4,575	4,575	— 20,525	

INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE [ICBM] MODERNIZATION

ICBM modernization.—The Committee's recommendation regarding modernization programs for our strategic land-based missiles fully provides all necessary funds for the budget request for the Peacekeeper [MX] rail garrison project and reduces funds for the small mobile ICBM [SICBM].

The Committee believes that new military and budget realities facing the United States raise serious questions about the military justification, schedule, cost, priority, and affordability of the small ICBM. The small ICBM is a weapon whose justification and urgency—especially its virtue of mobility—have been vastly undercut by the latest changes in the U.S.S.R. and the reduction in Soviet strategic nuclear warheads under the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty [START].

The Committee also understands that the Commander-in-Chief of the Air Force Strategic Air Command [CINCSAC], who is responsi-

ble for targeting our Nation's strategic arsenal, has indicated clearly that small ICBM only is needed as a hedge against either problems with the Minuteman III missiles or some surprise Soviet breakthrough which might threaten our missile submarines. Based on the latest available information, the Committee thinks neither event is likely.

CINCSAC also has testified to Congress it is less costly to maintain Minuteman III missiles in silos virtually indefinitely instead of continuing to develop and deploy small ICBM. Strategic Air Command experts estimate that the resilience of the Minuteman III weapon system permits it to be a viable strategic missile until at least the year 2010.

The Committee observes that the small ICBM program violates the Defense Department's full funding policy, since the \$6,030,000,000 needed in fiscal years 1993-97 to support the supposed initial operational capability [IOC] date of 1997-98 is not budgeted. Moreover, SICBM acquisition costs beyond fiscal year 1997 total \$31,000,000,000 and likely are unaffordable, in the Committee's judgment. Thus, small ICBM is too costly, and without funds budgeted for deployment, it is a missile lacking any real payoff in deterrence or defense terms.

Finally, the Committee believes that preserving a U.S. mobile ICBM capability to offset any Soviet mobile missiles can be done much less expensively with MX/rail garrison than with the small ICBM.

Therefore, the Committee recommendation provides \$347,647,000, a reduction of \$201,191,000 to the budget request which included 170 percent growth over the fiscal year 1991 appropriation. This respectable amount of funds—containing 42 percent growth compared with fiscal year 1991 funding—permits the Defense Department to reevaluate the entire justification and composition of the small ICBM program. The Committee directs the Pentagon to report to Congress on all these matters no later than May 1, 1992, to allow a full review during the fiscal year 1993 budget cycle.

With respect to the Peacekeeper/rail garrison program, the Committee's recommendation fully funds a flight test of the missile from its rail mobile basing train. The Committee has received a strong statement from the Air Force Chief of Staff attesting to the need for this flight test and reaffirming the Air Force's support for the current rail garrison program.

The Committee understands that such a test would be the first end-to-end system test to fully stress the missile and the train together to determine the operational viability of the basing mode. Such testing would permit faster resumption of the rail garrison program if changes in the nuclear threat require mobile MX deployment, according to the Air Force.

The Committee acknowledges the concerns expressed elsewhere in Congress with the fact that the Peacekeeper already has been designated a mobile missile in the newly signed START Treaty. However, the Committee views efforts to rescind this designation unilaterally by preventing missile integration with, and a flight test from, a rail garrison train as unnecessary and unwarranted.

The Committee notes that changing the Peacekeeper's status would require an amendment to the START Treaty, with all the

risks attendant with giving the Soviets the opportunity to reopen issues of their choosing. The Air Force claims that the United States received significant concessions by agreeing to the designation of the Peacekeeper as a mobile missile. The Committee suggests the United States should be reluctant to jeopardize these concessions, or to provide Soviet renegotiating opportunities in the uncertain international environment.

The Committee recommends statutory language to permit the Air Force to flight test the Peacekeeper from the rail garrison train.

The recommendation also deletes \$9,126,000 from the rail garrison project which the Air Force identified as unneeded for the requested purposes due to a reduced cost estimate for basing verification missiles.

Finally, the Committee directs that no funds may be transferred between separate projects within this program element without prior Committee approval through established reprogramming procedures. In the past, the Air Force attempted to shift significant sums between projects. This action, while technically permissible, clearly violates the spirit of the below-threshold-reprogramming limit intended to prevent major reallocations of resources among significant programs without prior congressional approval.

The following specific adjustments implement the Committee's recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
ICBM modernization	815,909	815,909	605,592	—210,317	—210,317
Peacekeeper	(2,906)	(2,906)	(2,906)		
Small ICBM	(548,838)	(548,838)	(347,647)	(—201,191)	(—201,191)
Rail mobile MX	(260,082)	(260,082)	(250,956)	(—9,126)	(—9,126)
START compliance	(4,083)	(4,083)	(4,083)		

ADDITIONAL ADJUSTMENTS

Contractor travel.—The Committee recommends reducing the Air Force's RDT&E budget request by \$38,630,000 due to expected savings from increased use of discount air fares. Further rationale is presented in the principal Committee observations section of this chapter. The House allowance does not make such a reduction.

Defense research sciences; other technology base university grants.—As explained in the principal Committee observations section, the Committee recommends \$195,307,000, a reduction of \$7,899,000, to the budget request for Air Force defense research sciences. This program element supports basic research in subjects of broad military interest. A reduction of \$5,742,000 also is recommended in funds requested for university grants in the exploratory and advanced development program elements.

These reductions are associated with savings due to expected changes in the allowable overhead rate charges on university re-

search grants and from more effective cost negotiating by the Defense Department with university practitioners. The Senate recommendation for defense research sciences is \$13,899,000 below the House allowance, which also made no reduction in the exploratory and advanced development university grants.

National aerospace plane technology program [NASP].—As already approved by the full Senate, the recommendation denies the full amount of \$231,833,000 requested for NASP. NASP is a \$10,000,000,000 program which is unaffordable and would divert scarce resources away from higher priority military and civilian space programs.

The program is significantly underfunded in both the Defense Department and National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA] budgets, which will only add to future fiscal problems for both departments. The House allowance approved the budget request.

Electronic warfare [EW] technology.—The Committee recommends \$32,693,000 for this program element for advanced development of aircraft electronic warfare technologies. The approved amount represents a reduction of \$3,152,000 to the budget request and is \$1,152,000 below the House allowance. Funds are denied as follows: (1) \$552,000 for two new starts for the agile laser and advanced infrared source projects, which duplicate Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA] work; and (2) \$2,600,000 for the Military Airlift Command EW suite, known as the large aircraft radar electronic warfare suite [LAREWS]. LAREWS is a premature new start in view of classified work which should be assessed for its applicability to large cargo aircraft.

As done with the Army and Navy, the Committee directs the Air Force to undertake a joint program with DARPA in fiscal year 1993 to adapt that agency's optical countermeasures project to meet triservice needs.

Civil and environmental engineering technology/active noise control.—The Committee recommends \$13,036,000, an increase of \$1,000,000 to the budget request, for this program element. The Committee understands the Air Force is pursuing initiatives for the active cancellation and suppression of aircraft and other system sound emissions and acoustic characteristics. The Committee endorses this work and provides the additional \$1,000,000 to this program to expand research initiatives in active noise control. The House allowance contains the budget request.

Over-the-horizon backscatter radar [OTH-B].—The Air Force requested \$7,961,000 to transfer management of the OTH-B network to the Air Force Logistics Command and to place the system in mothballs. The Committee believes that any activities to place OTH-B in caretaker status are not a legitimate RDT&E function. Any required funds, if properly justified, should be funded through the "Operations and maintenance" account. The Committee denies the full budget request, which is included in the House allowance.

Spacetrack.—This program element develops technologies, and maintains facilities, to improve Air Force space surveillance capabilities and to develop battle management/command, control, communications functions for antisatellite [ASAT] weapons. The Com-

mittee approves \$22,624,000, an increase of \$2,500,000 to the budget request and an amount \$12,500,000 above the House allowance.

The action adds \$2,500,000 only to establish an image information processing center to enhance the observations and assessment capabilities of the Air Force Maui Optical Station [AMOS] and Maui Optical Tracking Facility [MOTIF]. This center would create a computing facility built around newly emerging massively parallel computing technology. The Committee directs that these additional funds are available only for this stated purpose.

The Committee also is aware of a proposal to build and demonstrate a second generation laser radar system. An existing laser radar has demonstrated the capability to produce high resolution images of low altitude, rocket-launched test vehicles. The proposed laser radar would require access to a tracking telescope located at a site where the viewing conditions are not diminished by the surrounding atmosphere. At lower altitudes, much of the laser energy is lost in passing through the atmosphere. The surrounding atmospheric conditions are also important because at lower altitudes or in turbulent air, the radar image is distorted by the atmosphere. Finally, the laser radar should be located at a site providing opportunities to produce images of rocket launched flight test vehicles as well as objects in low Earth orbit.

The Committee believes, however, that the costs and requirements for this demonstration should be further validated. The Committee directs the Department of Defense [DOD] to review this laser radar proposal carefully and identify the costs and additional capabilities provided by such a system. The Committee expects DOD to budget for this project in fiscal year 1993 if the proposed system proves meritorious.

Follow-on early warning system [FEWS].—The Committee provides the requested \$82,000,000 to develop the future system to provide tactical warning and attack assessment [TW/AA] of missile attacks against the U.S. homeland.

The Committee observes that the current, proposed program also is underfunded by billions of dollars in the future years defense program [FYDP]. The Committee directs the Defense Department to fully fund FEWS in the fiscal years 1993-98 FYDP to be submitted to Congress early next year.

The House allowance denied all funds for FEWS development.

F-117 reconnaissance mods.—As already, approved by the full Senate, the Committee adds \$15,000,000 to the budget request to begin development of a tactical reconnaissance version of the F-117A stealth fighter. The advantages of stealth technology in penetrating highly defended adversary airspace were demonstrated convincingly in Operation Desert Storm.

The Committee believes that the proposed payload for this modification program should be either the Navy's tactical air reconnaissance pod [TARPS], which is already developed, or the advanced tactical aerial reconnaissance system [ATARS] under development. Strong consideration also should be given to enhancing the ATARS system for this mission with a synthetic aperture radar capability.

The Committee also recommends the addition of \$85,000,000 to the budget request for Air Force procurement to support these efforts.

The House allowance added \$83,000,000 to the budget request to develop other upgrades to the F-117A.

Short-range attack missile—tactical [SRAM-T].—The Committee deletes the \$34,346,000 sought to develop a new, air-delivered nuclear missile for deployment in NATO Europe. The recommendation terminates SRAM-T for both military and fiscal reasons.

First, SRAM-T's acquisition costs of more than \$1,000,000,000 are unjustified in this difficult budgetary environment. Second, the missile's military justification has been overtaken and eliminated by the demise of the Warsaw Pact as a threat to NATO Europe and the availability of other nuclear weapons to continue to deter any latent, resurgent, or new threat. In addition, the missile's initial operational capability would not occur until 1998, at the earliest. By then, the Committee thinks it is unlikely European publics will permit the weapon to be deployed overseas.

The Committee's recommendation also is consistent with the Fiscal Year 1992 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act. That act denies funds for SRAM-T production facilities at the Senate's initiative to terminate the nuclear warhead component of the program.

The House allowance also eliminated all funds for SRAM-T.

Electronic warfare [EW] development.—The Committee recommends \$197,971,000, a decrease of \$17,250,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$78,750,000 above the House allowance, for this program element of 13 projects to enhance electronic warfare systems/countermeasures for Air Force aircraft. The recommendation defers or reduces the following funds:

One, \$9,800,000 sought for side-by-side testing of radar warning receiver candidates for the B-1B bomber. The Senate already has denied authorization of these funds due to concerns about the viability of the B-1B in penetrating missions in the future and the need to assess alternative bomber force structures.

Two, \$4,300,000 sought in the airlift defensive systems project for C-27 aircraft work not projected last year for this year, or even included in the original fiscal year 1992 budget request. According to the Air Force, the C-27 defensive suite is low priority for the Military Airlift Command. The Committee believes the local commander's needs already are addressed through Operation Snow Storm defensive systems on other transport aircraft.

Three, \$2,100,000 identified by Air Force as unneeded due to a late contract award for compass call component development.

Four, \$1,050,000 requested for premature concept studies and laboratory demonstrations for the advanced strategic and tactical infrared expendable project. The deferred efforts were to create capabilities to succeed the newest capabilities for which development only is beginning. The Committee thinks follow-on activities should wait until current efforts produce a baseline against which to measure future needs. Also, the deferral permits more information to be available to better define future threats and to identify newer candidate technologies.

The Committee also directs that no funds may be transferred between separate projects within this program element without prior Committee approval. This direction is intended to prevent realloca-

tions among significant programs without prior congressional approval.

Joint tactical information distribution system [JTIDS].—The Committee approves \$16,421,000 requested and the same amount provided in the House allowance for this program element.

JTIDS is a triservice program which provides a jam-resistant, secure, voice and data distribution system for use in a tactical combat environment. Several members of NATO are pursuing JTIDS under the multifunction information distribution system [MIDS] project. JTIDS and MIDS increase the capabilities of U.S. and allied aircraft to communicate and operate with each other against increasingly sophisticated air, sea, and ground threats.

The Committee observes that, if the Air Force does not install JTIDS class 2 terminals on its F-15 aircraft, it may leave the F-15 with less interoperability with Navy, Army, and NATO systems.

The Committee directs the Air Force to prepare a plan to field two full wings of JTIDS equipped F-15 fighters and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees through the Secretary of Defense by November 1, 1991, on how this plan will be implemented. This report should address costs and benefits of this deployment, including all RDT&E and procurement required, and compare aircraft effectiveness with JTIDS and alternative communications systems.

The Air Force also is directed to identify costs for software modifications for the F-15E to accommodate JTIDS and, if affordable and militarily justified, include in its next budget request any portion of those costs required to be funded for expeditious fielding of the two full wings of aircraft.

Joint surveillance/target attack radar system [JSTARS].—JSTARS is an airborne surveillance system intended to identify and track, for targeting purposes, an adversary's ground forces far behind the forward line of troops. Conceived primarily for the NATO Europe war scenario, the aircraft demonstrated its utility in other scenarios during Operation Desert Storm.

The Committee is gratified by the success of the JSTARS deployment in Operation Desert Storm. However, deployment to the Persian Gulf delayed critical parts of the development program by at least 6 months. Also, the deployment demonstrated that significant additional development work must be accomplished, especially in the software area, before the system can be operationally reliable and operated and maintained by Air Force personnel instead of contractor scientists.

The Committee recommends \$316,859,000, an increase of \$5,000,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$10,800,000 above the House allowance. The additional funds are in response to an Air Force headquarters estimate of the resources needed to provide additional technical support for the JSTARS program office to begin to recover from the overseas deployment and to incorporate Persian Gulf lessons learned.

The Committee also recommends modifying previous congressional guidance against replacing outside technical assistance to the JSTARS program office with Air Force or civil service personnel as the overall level of technical assistance is reduced to meet budget limits.

This alteration to previous congressional direction that the program should decrease its excessive and costly technical support is recommended only in view of Desert Storm impacts. The Committee expects the Air Force to resume a graduated reduction in excessive JSTARS program support after the deployment impacts are reduced to acceptable levels.

The Committee also wishes to express its concern about increased concurrency in the JSTARS program and changes in important testing requirements prior to commitment of advanced procurement funds. The Committee understands these conditions have occurred due to the overseas deployments. Another source of concern is a program office which worries more about staff levels than managing JSTARS acquisition effectively.

Due to JSTARS demonstrated military utility, the Committee is reluctant to perturb further the system's schedule and initial operational capability date. The Committee gives the benefit of the doubt to Air Force claims that the system is ready for advanced procurement.

However, the Committee warns that the Air Force must continue to pay the highest level of attention to this program to minimize the possibilities of problems caused by increased concurrency and altered testing requirements. The Committee serves notice it will not hesitate to recommend program and funding changes in JSTARS next year if management, technical, cost, or schedule problems occur.

F-15E squadrons.—The Committee approves the \$119,795,000 for this program element but notes that the probe and drogue refueling upgrade project is not fully funded in fiscal year 1993. The Committee directs the Air Force to fully fund this project in RDT&E and procurement in the fiscal years 1993-98 future years defense program submitted to Congress next year. The House allowance deleted \$14,950,000 to defer improvements to maintenance test sets.

F-16 squadrons.—The recommendation provides \$159,978,000, a decrease of \$14,850,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$91,150,000 above the House allowance, for the program element to support maintaining and enhancing the F-16 fighter aircraft.

Recommended decreases to the F-16 program element are: (a) \$9,000,000 permitted by a lower cost estimate for modular mission computer development; (b) \$3,350,000 identified by the Air Force as unneeded to fund fiscal year 1992 efforts for the midlife upgrade project; and (c) \$2,500,000 that the service admitted is unneeded for 30 mm gun pod integration work in fiscal year 1992.

Tactical AIM missiles.—The Committee recommends \$13,558,000, a reduction of \$12,800,000 to the budget request and an amount \$13,558,000 above the House allowance, for this program element to improve the AIM-9 Sidewinder, short-range air-to-air missile.

Under a joint memoranda of agreement, the Air Force and Navy are developing Sidewinder enhancements. These improvements include near-term and mid-term upgrades—known respectively as the AIM-9M 8/9 and AIM-9R—and a far-term series of advancements known collectively as the AIM-9X.

The Committee's recommendation defers funds for the new AIM-9X missile and fully funds the AIM-9M 8/9 and AIM-9R.

The Committee observes that the near- and mid-term programs are well-established, address the most urgent threats, and are of relatively modest cost. On the other hand, the AIM-9X is projected to cost at least \$528,000,000 to develop. Most of this sum is not funded in the FYDP. The AIM-9X also lacks a firm requirements document and the Air Force and Navy both are uncertain about future inventory requirements for it and the AIM-9R.

The Committee believes the most urgent military requirements are addressed in the AIM-9M 8/9 and AIM-9R programs. However, the Committee is reluctant to endorse initiation in fiscal year 1992 of yet another upgrade without assurance it will be funded fully through completion.

Uncertainties about the future inventory requirements for both the R and X variants argue for a more deliberate pace in development of the far-term missile. For example, the Committee understands the Air Force is considering whether to alter current plans and procure AIM-9R missiles. Also, the Navy has yet to update its inventory requirements based on the major changes occurring in the international security environment.

Deferral of the AIM-9X permits the requirements, inventory, and funding issues to be resolved prior to beginning an expensive program. The Committee directs the Office of the Secretary of Defense to submit with the fiscal year 1993 budget request an updated inventory requirement for each service for each AIM-9 variant and a certification that RDT&E and procurement are fully funded in each service budget in the fiscal year 1993 budget request and the fiscal years 1993-98 FYDP to accomplish the projected program.

The Defense Secretary also is directed to submit at the same time a cost and operational effectiveness analysis [COEA] and an updated, validated threat assessment by the U.S. intelligence community comparing the capabilities of each variant to meet the most likely threats. The COEA and the threat assessment also should compare the abilities of R and X variants to counter the same threats to assist Congress in determining if the cost and effectiveness of the X warrants proceeding beyond the R upgrades package.

The House allowance transferred all funds requested in this Air Force program element to a consolidated line in the "Defense agencies RDT&E" account.

Seek Eagle.—The Committee provides \$21,090,000, a reduction of \$7,920,000 to the budget request for this program element which funds activities to certify the capabilities of specific aircraft to deliver particular weapons.

Deleted is \$1,020,000 associated with certification of the AGM-130C air-to-surface missile, since the Air Force will not begin development of the weapon until next fiscal year. Thus, *Seek Eagle* activities for AGM-130C are premature and unnecessary in fiscal year 1992.

The recommendation also denies \$6,900,000 and terminates the *Seek Eagle* technology applications project. The activity's large funding increase for fiscal year 1992 was not projected last year. Furthermore, the Committee believes the effort duplicates two projects in OSD to develop modern tracking, separation, data collection, and analysis capability to certify aircraft/weapons compatibility and to assess smart munitions.

The Committee recommendation is \$3,080,000 above the House allowance.

NAVSTAR global positioning system (space and control segments).—The Committee recommends \$70,105,000, an increase of \$18,100,000 to the budget request and an equal amount above the House allowance for this program element. These funds are transferred from the "Missile procurement, Air Force" account to meet RDT&E requirements to make the global positioning system [GPS] satellites and their nuclear detection system sensors more resistant to nuclear effects, such as heat and electromagnetic pulse interference.

Special operations forces.—The Committee denies \$1,991,000 in funds which, according to the budget justification material, have nothing to do with the special operations forces. The funds were requested to provide acquisition documentation for procurement and logistics support for purchase of new C-130H tactical airlift aircraft.

The Committee observes that the Air Force has been buying, operating, and maintaining new C-130H's for many years and suggests that additional planning documentation is unnecessary and unjustified.

The Committee action deletes all funds in this program element. The House allowance transferred these funds to a special operations forces program element in the "Defense agencies RDT&E" account.

Space test program.—The Committee includes \$47,524,000, a reduction of \$5,799,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$14,201,000 above the House allowance, for this program to launch scientific experiments on unmanned rocket boosters and the space shuttle. The Committee directs that none of the reduction be assessed against the APEX and SIDEX projects or any STEP projects.

The Committee directs that \$5,000,000 shall be made available only to maintain the activities of the high-frequency active auroral research program [HAARP] to evaluate the potential exploitation of the auroral ionospheric field for possible defense and civilian uses.

The space test program demonstrates emerging technologies as pathfinders for new Defense Department systems, such as the MACSAT satellites recently used in Operation Desert Storm. The Committee supports the program's use of small, adaptable payloads to provide timely space flight for technology development and demonstration experiments. This use can contribute to reducing the cost, schedule, and technical risk of employing such technologies in fully operational systems.

Advanced launch system.—The Committee agrees with the Senate-passed authorization decision to reduce funding for national launch system [NLS] development in view of overall high cost, massive underfunding, and questions about affordability of the program due to competing priorities. Between fiscal years 1994 and 2002, the program is underfunded by \$6,500,000,000 in the Air Force and \$5,600,000,000 in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA].

The Committee allocates \$50,000,000 for NLS, a budget decrease of \$97,744,000 as already endorsed by the full Senate. The provided

funds, along with fiscal year 1992 support in NASA and the strategic defense initiative, should continue engine development, minimal vehicle definition efforts, and payload interface planning. The House allowance eliminated all Air Force funds for NLS.

Range improvement.—The Committee recommends \$15,318,000, a reduction of \$61,150,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$57,750,000 below the House allowance for this program to fund test range instrumentation and simulators that replicate threat air defense systems.

The action defers \$55,000,000 to begin a major facility upgrade called the Electronic Combat Integrated Test [ECIT] facility and costing \$250,000,000 at the Air Force Flight Test Center. The Committee concludes ECIT is unjustified due to the possibility of substituting a less costly modification to a Navy facility and because firm test program requirements for ECIT are lacking.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense is directed to compare the costs of modifying the Navy facility—the air combat environment test and evaluation facility [ACETEF] at Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, MD—with ECIT costs and submit this comparison with the fiscal year 1993 budget request.

The Committee also eliminates \$6,150,000 sought for the Have Pewter project, since the Air Force violated the Fiscal Year 1991 Defense Appropriations Act conference report which denied all funds for the activity. The service is warned to pay better attention to conference reports in the future.

Training systems development.—The Committee recommends \$42,895,000, a reduction of \$8,850,000 to the budget request. The award of the contract to develop the simulator for electronic combat training [SECT] has been delayed from September 1991 until April 1992 making the denied funds excess to program requirements.

Initial operational test and evaluation [IOT&E].—The initial operational test and evaluation program element provides funds for the required testing of weapon systems to support early acquisition milestone decisions. The budget request provides 66 percent real growth in this program which is currently 44 percent obligated and 22 percent expended. In addition, the Air Force stated 59 IOT&E's will be conducted or continued in fiscal year 1992 instead of the 89 identified in the descriptive summaries to support the budget request. Based on these observations, the Committee recommends \$21,394,000, a reduction of \$5,000,000 to the budget request, and the same amount as the House allowance.

Development planning.—This program element funds long-range studies to assess future requirements and potential systems to meet these needs. It also funds preparation of acquisition documents for key decisions. The program has suffered in the past from the Air Force's inability to set priorities for studies in view of likely future budget constraints. The Committee believes program management has improved, but that more progress is needed.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends \$9,647,000, a reduction to the budget request of \$6,434,000 and an amount which is \$266,000 above the House allowance. Denied are 12 new start studies which are duplicative, premature, or unnecessary in view of new system development programs already underway.

The new studies denied by the Committee are: Tactical exploitation of national capabilities, infrared countermeasures for large aircraft, bomber improved penetration survivability, strategic planning for Air Force systems, mini-gunship/light transport study, suppression of enemy air defenses capability, worldwide ballistic missile attack warning confirmation and space surveillance, aerial refueling systems development plan, guidelines for cockpit architecture development, space-based wide area surveillance contributions to global power projection, military application of hypersonic technology, and advanced launch systems.

The Committee action does approve initiation of six, more justified new start studies. The Committee directs that the Air Force may not modify the studies and dollar amounts which have been approved from the topics and amounts identified in the Air Force communication to the Committee, dated August 29, 1991. The Committee directs that no additional funds be transferred to this program element and no additional studies be initiated in fiscal year 1992.

Satellite control network.—The Committee recommends \$117,433,000, a decrease of \$3,222,000 to the budget request and an equal amount below the House allowance. Funds are deferred for new start projects to develop architectures and provide system engineering, technology transition and standardization efforts for a new multiservice integrated satellite control system.

The Committee regards this effort as premature and unjustified. The Air Force also is seeking in the development planning program element in fiscal year 1992 to begin concept exploration specifically aimed at identifying key technologies and evaluating distributed satellite control architectures to allow an evolutionary, cost-effective transition to space assets control and away from ground sites. The Committee has approved the new study and thinks the service should await outcome of this effort before requesting funds for new technology development.

Titan space launch vehicles.—The Committee recommends \$193,915,000, an increase of \$50,000,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$125,000,000 above the House allowance for this program element. The added funds are provided to enhance development of improved capabilities for Titan IV, the Nation's primary heavy-lift space booster, and to address problems with development of the booster's solid rocket motor upgrade.

Industrial preparedness.—The Committee concurs with the Senate-approved authorization decision to transfer the \$50,535,000 requested for Air Force manufacturing technology developments to a consolidated program under OSD. Therefore, no funds are provided in this program element. The House allowance includes \$110,535,000 in this service line.

Poker Flats Rocket Range upgrade.—The Committee has closely monitored progress of the effort to upgrade Government-owned and funded rocket range facilities at the Poker Flats Range and believes that management of the upgrade program can best be accomplished under the direction of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA]. The Committee understands that the Senate version of the VA, HUD-Independent Agencies Appropria-

tions Act, 1992 includes language transferring responsibility for this program to NASA.

Any remaining funds appropriated to the Air Force for this program should be transferred to the new NASA management office as soon as possible. The Committee appreciates the work performed by the Air Force in establishing the implementation plan for the range upgrade, and believes this plan will provide both NASA and the Defense Department with significantly improved range facilities for future activities at Poker Flats.

Identification friend-or-foe [IFF] requirements.—The Committee is convinced that the operational requirement to adequately identify friendly aircraft from adversary aircraft remains important, even with the demise of the Mark 15 IFF program. The Pentagon is urged to finish, without delay, the ongoing requirements review and to include funds for any required, cost-effective improvements in U.S. IFF capabilities in the fiscal year 1993 budget request, instead of waiting until fiscal year 1994 as now planned.

The Committee thinks the United States should strive to undertake any follow-on program in cooperation with our allies, to ensure interoperability in future scenarios.

The Defense Department also is directed to identify any technology, hardware, and software products from the Mark 15 program which could be used to satisfy the new requirements and to incorporate those products to the maximum extent feasible and cost effective in any new IFF programs.

Thermionics technology development.—The Committee is aware of the potential for space nuclear power systems based on thermionics technologies. However, the Committee is aware there is no specific military requirement for such power systems. The Committee believes OSD should submit with the fiscal year 1993 budget request a new comparison of the acquisition cost, performance, size, weight, and cost effectiveness of thermionics technologies with other space power options.

Space object tracking issues.—The Committee understands that the Air Force is reviewing its requirements for space surveillance telescope capabilities in view of ongoing upgrade projects. This review should yield useful insights into whether additional upgrades, such as those suggested for the Malabar site, are militarily justified and cost effective. Until this review is completed and Congress can evaluate it, the Committee would be concerned that the proposed Malabar project could compete for funds and management attention with the ongoing improvement efforts. The Committee would be willing to consider the justification for any proposed enhancements to the Malabar telescope after the Air Force requirements review is completed.

Improved capability for development test and evaluation.—The Committee directs that \$9,700,000 of the amount provided for this program element is available only for continued acquisition of Global Positioning System Range Applications Joint Program Office instrumentation.

House actions not agreed to.—The Committee disagrees with the following recommendations contained in the House allowance:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
KC-135 squadrons	14,968	12,968	14,968		+2,000
Improved capability for development, test, and evaluation	56,259	46,159	56,259		+10,100
War planning automated data processing (ADP)—SAC	5,976	3,976	5,976		+2,000
Advanced aerial target development	25,321	22,311	25,321		+3,010
Human systems technology	53,673	63,673	53,673		-10,000
Civil engineering and environmental quality	6,744	16,744	6,744		-10,000
Advanced materials for weapon systems	17,887	15,887	17,887		+2,000
Advanced avionics for aerospace vehicles	38,001	34,001	38,001		+4,000
Advanced avionics integration	19,530	16,530	19,530		+3,000
Lincoln laboratory	27,891	27,609	27,891		+282
Space and missile rocket propulsion	14,866	11,366	14,866		+3,500
Advanced strategic missile system	63,045	60,845	63,045		+2,200
Advanced spacecraft technology	17,914	27,914	17,914		-10,000
Space systems environmental interactions technology	4,936	14,936	4,936		-10,000
Conventional weapons	33,621	30,421	33,621		+3,200
Advanced weapons technology	57,152	29,370	57,152		+27,782
B-1B	3,574	1,574	3,574		+2,000
Advanced cruise missile	108,698	28,898	108,698		+79,800
Minuteman squadrons	53,959	46,159	53,959		+7,800
Advanced warning system		82,000			-82,000
F-117A improvement		83,000			-83,000
Follow-on tactical reconnaissance system	56,553	173,953	56,553		-117,400
Nuclear weapons support	5,841	2,841	5,841		+3,000
C-17 Program	377,359	376,359	377,359		+1,000
Hardened target munitions	7,183	17,183	7,183		-10,000
Armament/ordnance development	4,812	8,612	4,812		-3,800
Aeromedical systems development	6,797	5,197	6,797		+1,600
Common support equipment development	12,675	9,675	12,675		+3,000
Surface defense suppression	21,464	16,064	21,464		+5,400
Computer resources management technology	8,419	17,419	8,419		-9,000
Advanced medium range air-to-air missile (AMRAAM)	30,582	27,882	30,582		+2,700
Tactical air control systems	23,564	15,564	23,564		+8,000
Mission planning systems	13,433	8,433	13,433		+5,000
Manpower, personnel, and training development	3,554	2,554	3,554		+1,000
Ranch hand II epidemiology study	9,710	2,010	9,710		+7,700
Real property maintenance—RDT&E	105,123	101,123	105,123		+4,000
Excimer laser		30,000			-30,000

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Senate compared with--	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL AF					
TECHNOLOGY BASE					
IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH.....	9,972	7,972	8,283	-1,689	+311
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES.....	203,206	209,206	195,307	-7,899	-13,899
OTHER TECH BASE UNIVERSITY GRANTS.....	---	---	195,307	-5,742	-5,742
GEOPHYSICS.....	40,441	38,541	39,052	-1,389	+511
MATERIALS.....	69,235	66,135	68,235	-1,000	+2,100
AEROSPACE FLIGHT DYNAMICS.....	71,656	68,356	65,055	-6,601	-3,301
HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY.....	53,673	63,673	53,673	---	-10,000
AEROSPACE PROPULSION.....	69,355	72,355	68,055	-1,300	-4,300
AEROSPACE AVIONICS.....	83,086	73,086	80,290	-2,796	+7,204
PERSONNEL, TRAINING AND SIMULATION.....	30,953	30,953	30,053	-900	-900
ROCKET PROPULSION AND ASTRONAUTICS TECHNOLOGY.....	6,744	16,744	6,744	---	-10,000
CIVIL ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY.....	47,341	37,341	43,050	-4,291	+5,709
ADVANCED WEAPONS.....	38,450	38,450	37,605	-845	-845
CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS.....	43,010	43,010	43,010	---	---
COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS.....	88,665	88,665	82,206	-6,459	-6,459
PRECOMPETITIVE TECHNOLOGY.....	---	---	---	---	---
TOTAL, TECHNOLOGY BASE.....	855,787	854,487	814,876	-40,911	-39,611
ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT					
LOGISTICS SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY.....	14,649	14,649	6,649	-8,000	-8,000
INETS/ICNIA.....	---	---	---	---	---
ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS.....	17,887	15,887	17,887	---	+2,000
AEROSPACE PROPULSION SUBSYSTEMS INTEGRATION.....	30,295	30,295	28,720	-1,575	-1,575

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate compared with--
ADVANCED AVIONICS FOR AEROSPACE VEHICLES.....	38,001	34,001	38,001	---	---	+4,000
AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY.....	22,858	22,858	12,058	-10,800	-10,800	-10,800
AEROSPACE STRUCTURES.....	20,113	20,113	20,113	---	---	---
AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY.....	42,057	42,057	42,057	---	---	---
PERSONNEL, TRAINING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY.....	9,501	9,501	9,501	---	---	---
CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY.....	18,542	18,542	18,542	---	---	---
ADVANCED FIGHTER TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION.....	24,073	24,073	10,173	-13,900	-13,900	-13,900
LINCOLN LABORATORY.....	27,891	27,609	27,891	---	---	+282
ADVANCED AVIONICS INTEGRATION.....	19,530	16,530	19,530	---	---	+3,000
NATIONAL AERO SPACE PLANE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.....	231,833	231,833	32,693	-231,833	-231,833	-231,833
EW TECHNOLOGY.....	35,845	33,845	14,866	-3,152	-3,152	-1,152
SPACE AND MISSILE ROCKET PROPULSION.....	14,866	11,366	63,045	---	---	+3,500
ADVANCED STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS.....	63,045	60,845	2,131	---	---	+2,200
ARMAMENT TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION.....	2,131	2,131	2,131	---	---	---
ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY.....	17,914	27,914	17,914	---	---	-10,000
SPACE SYSTEMS ENVIRONMENTAL INTERACTIONS TECHNOLOGY.....	4,936	14,936	4,936	---	---	-10,000
SPACE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY.....	25,100	4,575	4,575	-20,525	-20,525	---
CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS.....	33,621	30,421	33,621	---	---	+3,200
ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY.....	57,152	29,370	57,152	---	---	+27,782
WEATHER SYSTEMS - ADV DEV.....	5,533	5,533	5,533	---	---	---
CIVIL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.....	12,036	12,036	13,036	+1,000	+1,000	+1,000
C31 SUBSYSTEM INTEGRATION.....	9,483	9,483	9,483	---	---	---
ADVANCED COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY.....	9,857	9,857	9,857	---	---	---
C3 ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT.....	9,635	9,635	9,635	---	---	---
ADVANCED SPECIAL OPERATIONS RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
TOTAL, ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	818,384	769,895	529,599	-288,785	-288,785	-240,296

[In thousands of dollars]

	Senate compared with--			
	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Budget estimate House allowance
STRATEGIC PROGRAMS				
RELOCATABLE TARGET-CAPABILITY PROGRAM.....	---	---	---	---
B-1B.....	3,574	1,574	3,574	---
B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER.....	1,563,072	1,563,072	1,563,072	+2,000
SHORT RANGE ATTACK MISSILE II (SRAM II) - ENG DEV.....	165,879	165,879	165,879	---
ICBM MODERNIZATION.....	815,909	815,909	605,592	-210,317
PEACEKEEPER.....	(2,906)	(2,906)	(2,906)	---
SMALL ICBM.....	(548,838)	(548,838)	(347,647)	(-201,191)
RAIL MOBILE MX.....	(260,082)	(260,082)	(250,956)	(-9,126)
START COMPLIANCE.....	(4,083)	(4,083)	(4,083)	---
AIR LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM).....	---	---	---	---
SPACE-BASED RADAR (SBR) FSD.....	6,745	6,745	6,745	---
SYSTEMS SURVIVABILITY (NUCLEAR EFFECTS).....	3,981	3,981	3,981	---
B-52 SQUADRONS.....	108,698	28,898	108,698	+79,800
ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE.....	14,968	12,968	14,968	+2,000
KC-135 SQUADRONS.....	53,959	46,159	53,959	+7,800
MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS.....	1,314	1,314	1,314	---
PACCS AND WABNCP SYSTEM EC-135 CLASS V MOOS.....	5,976	3,976	5,976	+2,000
WAR PLANNING AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING (ADP) - SAC.....	133,000	133,000	133,000	---
NCMC - TI/AA SYSTEMS.....	5,390	5,390	5,390	---
JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM.....	13,019	13,019	13,019	---
SURVEILLANCE RADAR STATIONS/SITES.....	2,862	2,862	2,223	-639
DISTANT EARLY WARNING (DEW) RADAR STATIONS.....	17,887	17,887	17,887	-7,961
OVER-THE-HORIZON BACKSCATTER RADAR.....	20,124	10,124	22,624	+12,500
BALLISTIC MISSILE EARLY WARNING SYSTEM (BMEWS).....	53,423	53,423	53,423	---
SPACETRACK.....	82,000	---	82,000	+82,000
DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM.....	966	966	966	---
FOLLOW-ON EARLY WARNING SYSTEM.....	---	---	---	---
SUBMARINE-LAUNCHED BALLISTIC MISSILE (SLBM) RADAR WARN	---	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Budget estimate	House allowance
NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM.....	6,873	6,873	6,873		
NATIONAL EMERGENCY AIRBORNE COMMAND POST AND E-48 CLAS	---	---	---		
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (ME	20,577	20,577	20,577		
WORLD-WIDE MILITARY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS, INFOR	816	816	816		
ADVANCED WARNING SYSTEM.....	---	82,000	---		-82,000
MILSTAR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (AF TERMINALS)	161,183	161,183	161,183		
MILSTAR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM.....	901,263	901,263	901,263		
MILITARY AIRLIFT GROUP (IF).....	---	---	---		
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	360,715	441,715	316,715	-44,000	-125,000
TOTAL, STRATEGIC PROGRAMS.....	4,532,134	4,509,534	4,271,717	-260,417	-237,817

TACTICAL PROGRAMS

ADVANCED TACTICAL FIGHTER.....	---	---	---	---	---
INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT.....	5,497	5,497	5,497	---	---
AIR BASE OPERABILITY ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT.....	3,375	3,375	---	-3,375	-3,375
LOW COST ANTI-RADIATION SEEKER.....	---	---	---	---	---
COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATION APPLICATIONS.....	3,399	3,399	3,399	---	---
DOO PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT - EXTERIOR.....	741	741	741	---	---
COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY.....	23,896	23,896	23,896	---	---
AIRCRAFT AVIONICS EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT.....	14,909	14,909	14,909	---	---
AIRCRAFT EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT.....	4,093	4,093	4,093	---	---
ENGINE MODEL DERIVATIVE PROGRAM (EMOP).....	1,022	1,022	1,022	---	---
F-117A IMPROVEMENT.....	---	83,000	---	---	-83,000
NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT.....	5,841	2,841	5,841	---	+3,000
ALTERNATE FIGHTER ENGINE.....	---	---	---	---	+1,000
C-17 PROGRAM.....	377,359	376,359	377,359	---	---
SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING (SUPT).....	4,274	4,274	4,274	---	---
INFRARED SEARCH AND TRACK SYSTEM.....	---	---	---	---	---

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Senate compared with--	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
VARIABLE STABILITY IN-FLIGHT SIMULATOR TEST AIRCRAFT..	2,090	2,090	2,090	---	---
ADVANCED TACTICAL FIGHTER FSD.....	1,637,182	1,637,182	1,637,182	---	---
ADVANCED TACTICAL AIRCRAFT.....	---	---	---	---	---
SHORT RANGE ATTACK MISSILE - TACTICAL (SRAM-T).....	34,346	---	---	-34,346	---
MODULAR AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT.....	---	---	---	---	---
NIGHT/PRECISION ATTACK.....	---	---	---	---	---
INTEGRATED EW/CNI DEVELOPMENT.....	26,639	26,639	26,639	---	---
AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	---	---	---	---	---
EW DEVELOPMENT.....	114,101	114,101	114,101	---	---
B-1B RWR.....	215,221	119,221	197,971	-17,250	+78,750
HARDENED TARGET MUNITIONS.....	7,183	17,183	7,183	---	-10,000
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT.....	12,741	12,741	12,741	---	---
ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT.....	4,812	8,612	4,812	---	-3,800
SUBMUNITIONS.....	5,082	5,082	5,082	---	---
WIDE-AREA, ANTI-ARMOR MUNITIONS.....	---	---	---	---	---
AIR BASE OPERABILITY.....	10,170	10,170	10,170	---	---
AEROMEDICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	6,797	5,197	6,797	---	+1,600
COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT.....	12,675	9,675	12,675	---	+3,000
LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS.....	12,253	12,253	12,253	---	---
CIVIL, FIRE, ENVIRONMENTAL, SHELTER ENGINEERING.....	2,661	2,661	2,661	---	---
COMBAT IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS.....	---	---	---	---	---
SURFACE DEFENSE SUPPRESSION.....	21,464	16,064	21,464	---	+5,400
COMPUTER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT TECHNOLOGY.....	8,419	17,419	8,419	---	-9,000
INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT.....	2,983	2,983	2,983	---	---
JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS).....	16,421	16,421	16,421	---	---
JOINT LOOKING AIRBORNE RADAR.....	4,166	4,166	---	-4,166	---
JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS).....	311,859	306,059	316,859	+5,000	+10,800
JOINT INTEROPERABILITY OF TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL S.....	5,622	5,622	5,622	---	---
F-111 SQUADRONS.....	30,067	30,067	30,067	---	---
F-15A/B/C/D SQUADRONS.....	---	---	---	---	---
A-10 SQUADRONS.....	12,832	12,832	12,832	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Senate compared with--	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
F-16 SQUADRONS.....	174,828	68,828	159,978	-14,850	+91,150
F-15E SQUADRONS.....	119,795	104,845	119,795	---	+14,950
MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION.....	5,000	5,000	5,000	---	---
F-117A SQUADRONS.....	22,762	22,762	22,762	---	---
F-117 RECCE MODS.....	---	---	15,000	+15,000	+15,000
TACTICAL AIM MISSILES.....	26,358	---	13,558	-12,800	+13,558
TACTICAL AGM MISSILES.....	---	---	---	---	---
ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM).....	30,582	27,882	30,582	---	+2,700
F-111 SELF PROTECTION SYSTEMS.....	---	---	---	---	---
TR-1 SQUADRON.....	54,220	54,220	---	-54,220	-54,220
FOLLOW-ON TACTICAL RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM.....	56,553	173,953	56,553	---	-117,400
AF TENCAP.....	562	562	562	---	---
TACIT RAINBOW.....	---	---	---	---	---
OVERSEAS AIR WEAPON CONTROL SYSTEM.....	2,156	2,156	2,156	---	---
TACTICAL AIR CONTROL SYSTEMS.....	23,564	15,564	23,564	---	+8,000
AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS).....	202,129	202,129	202,129	---	---
TACTICAL AIRBORNE COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS.....	3,483	3,483	3,483	---	---
ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS.....	3,980	3,980	3,980	---	---
TACTICAL AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES.....	---	---	---	---	---
SEEK EAGLE.....	29,010	18,010	21,090	-7,920	+3,080
MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS.....	13,433	8,433	13,433	---	+5,000
JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC).....	6,709	6,709	6,709	---	---
ELECTRONIC COMBAT SUPPORT.....	2,678	2,678	2,678	---	---
SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS TERMINALS.....	2,208	2,208	2,208	---	---
NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM (NAS) PLAN.....	4,687	2,687	3,256	-1,431	+569
CONSTANT SOURCE.....	8,165	8,165	8,165	---	---
ELECTRONIC COMBAT INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT.....	1,858	1,858	1,858	---	---
MAC COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM.....	11,570	11,570	11,570	---	---
C-130J.....	---	---	---	---	---
SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES.....	1,991	---	---	-1,991	---

[In thousands of dollars]

	Senate compared with--			
	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Budget estimate House allowance
A-7 SQUADRONS (ANG).....	---	---	---	---
FORCE ENHANCEMENTS-ACTIVE.....	---	---	---	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	977,309	735,639	1,202,509	+225,200 +466,870
TOTAL, TACTICAL PROGRAMS.....	4,747,782	4,401,167	4,840,633	+92,851 +439,466
=====				
INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS				
DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM.....	14,394	14,394	14,394	---
LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS).....	3,555	3,555	3,555	---
ELECTROMAGNETIC COMPATIBILITY ANALYSIS CENTER (ECAC).....	10,133	10,133	10,133	---
TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (TRICALS).....	11,359	11,359	11,359	---
NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT).....	14,407	14,407	14,407	---
NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTROL S).....	52,005	52,005	70,105	+18,100
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	2,333,744	2,221,733	2,175,244	-158,500 -46,489
CAVALRY.....	---	---	---	---
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO OSD COUNTERNARCOTICS.....	---	---	---	---
TOTAL, INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS.....	2,439,597	2,327,586	2,299,197	-140,400 -28,389
=====				
DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT				
SPACE TEST PROGRAM.....	53,323	33,323	47,524	-5,799 +14,201
SATELLITE SYSTEMS SURVIVABILITY.....	8,681	8,681	8,681	---
ADVANCED AERIAL TARGET DEVELOPMENT.....	25,321	22,321	25,321	---
TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	51,745	41,745	42,895	-8,850 +1,150
MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING DEVELOPMENT.....	3,554	2,554	3,554	---
ADVANCED LAUNCH SYSTEM.....	147,744	---	50,000	-97,744 +50,000
R&M MATURATION/TECHNOLOGY INSERTION.....	20,999	18,999	---	-20,999 -18,999

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate compared with--
WEATHER SYSTEMS - ENG DEV.....	5,299	5,299	5,299	---	---	---
RANGE IMPROVEMENT.....	76,468	73,068	15,318	-61,150	-57,750	---
ELECTROMAGNETIC RADIATION TEST FACILITIES.....	4,768	4,768	4,768	---	---	---
IMPROVED CAPABILITY FOR DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION.....	56,259	46,159	56,259	---	+10,100	---
PROJECT AIR FORCE.....	22,488	22,488	22,488	---	---	---
RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY.....	9,710	2,010	9,710	---	+7,700	---
SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
NAVIGATION/RADAR/SLED TRACK TEST SUPPORT.....	25,935	25,935	25,935	---	---	---
INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION.....	26,394	21,394	21,394	-5,000	---	---
TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT.....	402,330	371,330	371,330	-31,000	---	---
DEVELOPMENT PLANNING.....	16,081	9,381	9,647	-6,434	+266	---
DYCOMS.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
ROT&E AIRCRAFT SUPPORT.....	43,503	43,503	43,503	---	---	---
REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE - RDT&E.....	105,123	101,123	105,123	---	+4,000	---
BASE OPERATIONS - RDT&E.....	76,306	76,306	76,306	---	---	---
SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK.....	120,655	120,655	117,433	-3,222	-3,222	---
MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLES.....	45,615	45,615	45,615	---	---	---
CONSOLIDATED SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER.....	15,657	15,657	15,657	---	---	---
UPPER STAGE SPACE VEHICLES.....	5,957	5,957	5,957	---	---	---
TITAN SPACE LAUNCH VEHICLES.....	143,915	68,915	193,915	+50,000	+125,000	---
DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (DMSP).....	28,478	28,478	28,478	---	---	---
SPACE SHUTTLE OPERATIONS.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
INVENTORY CONTROL POINT OPERATIONS.....	2,967	2,967	2,967	---	---	---
DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF).....	2,959	2,959	2,959	---	---	---
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS.....	50,535	110,535	---	-50,535	-110,535	---
LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES.....	6,614	6,614	6,614	---	---	---
PRODUCTIVITY, RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY, MAINTAIN. PRO.....	24,364	24,364	24,364	---	---	---
CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM.....	5,199	5,199	5,199	---	---	---
INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES.....	3,970	2,970	2,970	-1,000	---	---
RANGE SECURITY.....	---	---	---	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Senate compared with--	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
AEROSPACE CORPORATION/FFRDC.....	---	---	---	---	---
MITRE - C(3)1/FFRDC.....	---	---	---	---	---
LINCOLN LABORATORY/FFRDC.....	---	---	---	---	---
EXCIMER LASER.....	---	30,000	---	---	-30,000
CONTRACTOR TRAVEL.....	---	---	-38,630	-38,630	-38,630
TOTAL, DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT.....	1,638,916	1,401,272	1,358,553	-280,363	-42,719
RESCISSION TO BE DETERMINED.....	---	---	---	---	---
DBOF TECHNICAL CORRECTION: DTIC.....	---	---	6,300	+6,300	+6,300
DBOF TECHNICAL CORRECTION: IACS.....	---	---	2,800	+2,800	+2,800
THERNIONICS.....	---	---	---	---	---
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL AF.....	15,032,600	14,263,941	14,123,675	-908,925	-140,266

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE AGENCIES

Appropriations, 1991	\$9,115,699,000
Budget estimate, 1992	10,238,500,000
House allowance	8,979,141,000
Committee recommendation	9,393,542,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$9,393,542,000 for the Defense agencies' research, development, test, and evaluation programs, a decrease of \$844,958,000 to the budget request. The recommendation is \$414,401,000 above the House allowance.

SUMMARY TABLE

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Change from budget
Technology base	1,252,626	1,078,357	-174,269
Advanced technology development	5,906,961	5,442,812	-464,149
Strategic programs	533,606	363,356	-190,250
Tactical programs	628,863	659,397	+30,534
Intelligence and communications	1,756,482	1,525,282	-231,200
Defensewide mission support	139,962	318,338	+178,376

The budget activities and programs funded under this appropriation are discussed below.

CLASSIFIED PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to classified programs, as explained in the classified annex to the Committee's report:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Airborne reconnaissance support program	222,800	322,800		-222,800	-322,800
Intelligence and communications programs	1,226,759	1,263,088	1,218,359	-8,400	-44,729

OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request to concur, or partially concur, with the Senate-passed defense authorization legislation:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Advanced materials			15,000	+15,000	+15,000
Manufacturing engineering education			25,000	+25,000	+25,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Managers in the classrooms.....			5,000	+ 5,000	+ 5,000
United States-Japan management training.....			10,000	+ 10,000	+ 10,000
Defense business operations fund [DBOF] technical corrections:					
DTIC.....			4,200	+ 4,200	+ 4,200
IACS.....			1,800	+ 1,800	+ 1,800

United States-Japan management training.—The Committee directs that the Defense Department allocate the funds provided for this program element to achieve a wider geographic distribution among participating institutions. The Committee believes that special consideration for funding should be given to institutions, which by virtue of their geographic proximity to Japan, have special expertise and insights into United States-Japan relations.

STRATEGIC DEFENSE AND THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE INITIATIVES

Strategic defense initiative [SDI]; theater missile defense initiative [TMDI]—demonstration/validation; theater missile defense initiative—full-scale development.—The Committee recommends a total of \$4,600,000,000 for the strategic defense initiative and theater missile defense initiative programs to research and develop technologies to defend the United States, its allies, and forward-deployed forces against ballistic missile attacks.

The recommended amount is the same as that already approved in the Senate-passed Defense authorization. This amount is \$27,426,000 above the budget request and \$1,944,000,000 above the House allowance. The Committee's recommendation reflects the following actions:

One, funding \$105,046,000 in projects transferred from the Defense Nuclear Agency [DNA] since these activities primarily support development of SDI systems and technologies; the projects are listed in a later report entry explaining all DNA budget adjustments.

Two, providing \$40,000,000 which is available only for the superconductive magnetic energy storage [SMES] project; the House allowance provided the same amount in a separate program element.

Three, allocating \$107,344,000 for enhanced development of advanced technologies (that is, ground-based free electron laser, neutral particle beam) with greater potential to defend against a resurgent Soviet threat or ballistic missile proliferation; these funds also are available to offset a possible underfunding of efforts to field Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty-compliant, ground-based limited defenses.

Four, deferring \$252,390,000 for certain theater missile defense efforts funded in the SDI and TMDI program elements.

Since funds for theater missile defense efforts are allocated within three SDI and TMDI program elements, the Committee's overall recommendation for such activities still totals \$604,270,000.

Compared with the current fiscal year, this amount represents almost 50 percent growth in funding after excluding inflation.

The projects and funding amounts deferred, either wholly or in part, are: (a) theater high altitude area defense [THAAD], \$150,000,000; (b) ground based radar [GBR], \$58,390,000; (c) advanced contingency theater sensor, \$27,000,000; (d) foreign technology support, \$12,000,000 for unidentified experiments; and (e) directed energy weapons, \$5,000,000.

The Committee's recommendations about these projects reflect several major Committee concerns with the costs, schedule, composition, and management of the Defense Department's theater missile defense activities.

Even before the experiences of Operation Desert Storm, the Committee and its House counterpart took the leadership to accelerate the Defense Department's programs to develop theater missile defenses. The conference report on the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1991, added almost \$100,000,000 to the budget request to support this acceleration. The conference report statement of managers also concluded that a U.S. tactical ballistic missile system should be fielded as soon as technologically and fiscally feasible.

Unfortunately, the Department's response to this guidance has been to propose a \$9,609,570,000 acquisition program which does not appear to be based on firm program plans, efficient management, firm military requirements, and prudent technology choices.

The Committee observes that the legitimate need to field effective tactical missile defenses without delay does not relieve the Defense Department from the requirement to prevent wasteful and hasty use of scarce defense dollars by strictly adhering to sound budget justification and program management and oversight procedures.

The Committee notes that specific problems also exist with the deferred theater missile defense efforts.

Several of these costly projects lack firm military requirements or program plans. The program managers have been unable to provide specific justification for the budgets they are requesting. Absent these justifications, the Committee would, in essence, be granting a blank check to the developers if it approved their budget requests.

There also are significant disagreements between the intended operator of the THAAD and GBR systems, the Army, and the manager of the acquisition efforts, the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization [SDIO], on the military and performance requirements, technologies to be developed, and acquisition strategy. THAAD is intended to be the centerpiece weapon of the new theater missile defense architecture. GBR is intended to be the centerpiece sensor for the architecture.

Under these uncertain conditions, the Committee does not believe it is prudent to approve the programs listed above. Those programs are deferred without prejudice. The Committee will review these programs during the fiscal year 1993 budget cycle and directs the Defense Department to resolve these uncertainties in time to reflect these resolutions in the fiscal year 1993 budget request.

On the other hand, the Committee robustly funds those programs which the experiences of Desert Storm clearly demonstrate have the potential, even without the deferred projects, to embody substantial theater missile defense capabilities for our forward-deployed troops and allies. These programs are the Patriot missile system upgrades, extended range interceptor development, the ARROW continuation experiments, and Corps surface-to-air missile [CORPSAM] concept development. The Committee directs that these projects receive the full amount requested for each in the original budget submission to Congress.

Furthermore, the Committee understands informal discussions have been held between the United States and Israel for the funding and development of a fire control system for the Arrow antithreat/tactical ballistic missile and related technologies. These efforts are known as the music radar system. Prospects also exist for expanded efforts to fund and develop the array of systems designed to implement the Arrow theater missile defenses, the battle management test bed, lethality, system integration and engineering, hypervelocity gun research and fire control and kinetic kill evaluation devices. These latter activities are known collectively as Arrow systems development.

The Committee believes that, upon favorable outcome of these discussions and evaluation of the other prospects for expanded efforts, there are sufficient funds in the SDI/TMDI program elements for both the Arrow systems development activities and the music radar system development. The Committee understands that \$44,400,000 could be needed for the Arrow systems development activities and \$20,000,000 could be needed for the music radar efforts.

With respect to other SDI matters, the Committee is concerned a formal environmental impact statement [EIS] has not been accomplished for SDI's strategic target system [STARS] program. STARS proposes to launch rockets from the Navy's Pacific Missile Range Facility, Barking Sands, Kauai, HI, to gather data and test equipment.

Accordingly, a general provision is recommended which prohibits use of any funds available to the Defense Department during fiscal year 1992 for any activities to support the objective of launching STARS rockets from Hawaii, with the exception of any funds required to conduct a formal EIS. The bill language would permit use of funds to maintain certain range facilities and the safety and reliability of STARS equipment, and to perform minimal program activities in the continental United States. Funding restrictions would be released upon completion of the formal EIS process mandated by law. The Committee has added \$1,500,000 to the Army's Kwajalein Atoll program element to fund the STARS EIS.

With the new focus of SDI on limited and accidental attacks and on theater defense, a new and important opportunity for ground-based directed energy defensive weapons has emerged that supports the continued viability of planned architectures against the anticipated threats. The Committee directs the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization [SDIO] to present the Congress, within 3 months of the enactment of the fiscal year 1992 Defense appropriations measure, an analysis that shows the relevance of the various

directed energy technologies to the SDIO objectives and a roadmap as to how they will be developed to support those objectives.

The administration should present Congress with a description, in sufficient detail, of what interceptors, radars, early warning satellites, command and control networks, and other system elements would be a part of the ground-based ballistic missile defense system funded in this bill. Cost estimates for a single-site version of ballistic missile defense, as well as multisite variants, should be included. This information should accompany the President's budget request, and in any event should be presented to Congress no later than April 15, 1992. This information should be submitted in both classified and unclassified formats.

Finally, the Committee declares its support for the broad-based SMES technology program with its promising potential for the defense and civilian sectors. To date, approximately \$35,000,000 has been invested in this activity from both Defense Department and private sources.

The Committee is disappointed that the Defense Department has not yet completed the phase I contractor down-select process. The Committee directs that phase II should be initiated and aggressively pursued beginning with the obligation of the approximately \$10,000,000 remaining unobligated of the funds appropriated for fiscal year 1991.

To support this direction, the Committee recommends statutory language which directs the Defense Department to complete the contractor down-select process within 60 days after enactment of the fiscal year 1992 Defense appropriations measure. The bill language also requires the obligation of all remaining fiscal year 1991 funds within 120 days of the act's enactment.

The specific adjustments to implement the Committee's strategic and theater missile defense program recommendations are:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Strategic defense initiative [SDI].....	4,572,574	2,656,000	4,600,000	+27,426	+1,944,000
Theater missile defense initiative [TMDI]:					
Dem/Val	508,000	787,460		-508,000	-787,460
FSD	70,000	70,000		-70,000	-70,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

Consolidated DOD software initiative.—The Committee recommends \$37,100,000, a reduction of \$6,900,000 to the budget request and an amount \$16,900,000 below the House allowance. The reduction denies \$6,900,000 of the funds requested for the software technology for adaptable reliable systems [STARS] project in the consolidated DOD software initiative program element. The Committee reduces a requested major expansion of STARS because proposed DOD participants in new software technology insertion demonstrations have yet to be identified. Also, the policies and proce-

dures defining the risks and responsibilities of the STARS contractors to the selected DOD programs have yet to be established.

Capacity building initiative for HBCU's and MI's.—Five years ago the Congress passed section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987, which established a 5-percent goal for the award of certain Department of Defense dollars to small disadvantaged businesses [SDB's], historically black colleges and universities [HBCU's], and other minority institutions [MI's].

To help attain the 5-percent goal, section 1207 authorized the Department to provide technical assistance to disseminate knowledge of the program, Department of Defense procurement procedures, and instruction in the preparation of proposals in response to Department of Defense solicitations. While the schools have found this assistance useful to develop an understanding of the operation of the defense procurement process, it does not address the fundamental problem which precludes them from successfully competing in the defense research arena. A 1990 Department of Defense report on the operation of the section 1207 program stated that "there are * * * a large number of HBCU's/MI's that simply do not yet have the capacity or adequate resources for developing a competitive edge in the Department of Defense procurement system." This lack of capacity or infrastructure has resulted in the award of little more than \$10,000,000 in defense research awards to HBCU's in 1990. During this same period majority institutions of higher education received roughly \$1,200,000,000 for defense research.

Section 832 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 amended section 1207 and authorized the Department of Defense additional statutory authority to provide capacity building assistance to address this problem. Section 832 required the Secretary of Defense to establish a specific subgoal for the award of defense research work to HBCU's/MI's. To ensure a reasonable opportunity of attaining the subgoal, the Department of Defense was authorized to provide capacity building assistance to HBCU's/MI's to enhance their capabilities to perform defense research. The assistance may include: faculty development programs in undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral programs; the lending of Department of Defense personnel to assist school faculty, teach, and perform defense research; the establishment of partnerships with defense laboratories to instruct students; the award of scholarships, fellowships, and the establishment of cooperative work-education programs; and the equipping and renovation of research laboratories.

Thus, section 1207 as amended authorizes the Department of Defense to provide capacity building assistance where the Department of Defense determines that its requirements can be fulfilled by an HBCU/MI. In amending section 1207 the Congress anticipated that HBCU/MI participation in the defense research arena can be enhanced.

The Committee strongly supports the efforts of the authorization committees and has provided \$15,000,000 in fiscal year 1992 only for capacity building assistance as authorized in section 1207(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987. This is a matter of congressional interest and shall be reflected as such on the DD 1414. The Committee further expects the Depart-

ment to budget not less than \$15,000,000 in fiscal year 1993 and the out-years for the continuation of this important program.

The Committee strongly supports the need to expand the defense research base by enhancing the capabilities of HBCU's/MI's to perform defense research. Expansion of the defense research base to include these schools will assist the Department of Defense in maintaining the Nation's technological superiority well into the 21st century and in so doing, enhance our national defense and productivity.

Contractor travel.—The Committee recommends reducing the Defense agencies' RDT&E budget request by \$25,574,000 due to expected savings from increased use of discount air fares. Further rationale is presented in the principal Committee observations section of this chapter. The House allowance does not make such a reduction.

Defense research sciences; other technology base university grants.—The Committee recommends \$95,058,000, an increase of \$6,768,000 to the budget request for Defense agencies defense research sciences. This program element supports basic research in subjects of broad military interest. A reduction of \$18,545,000 also is recommended in funds requested for university grants in the exploratory and advanced development program elements.

These reductions are associated with savings due to expected changes in the allowable overhead rate charges on university research grants and from more effective cost negotiating by the Defense Department with university practitioners. As explained in the principal Committee observations section, the reductions also are recommended to prevent further abuses in university research grants.

The recommendation for defense research sciences reflects a \$3,432,000 reduction in university grant funds and addition of \$3,000,000 to the Defense Research Projects Agency's current information sciences program. Of the additional funds, \$3,000,000 is available only to support the first year of a 2-year, \$6,000,000 project to develop automated design tools and processes for the production of multichip, high-speed digital electronics modules. Another \$7,200,000 is added, as authorized by the Senate, for a new DARPA initiative for a software reuse consortium.

The Senate recommendation for defense research sciences is \$13,232,000 below the House allowance, which made no reduction in the exploratory and advanced development university grants.

University research initiatives.—The Committee recommends \$90,580,000, an addition of \$3,207,000 to the budget request and an amount \$91,793,000 below the House allowance, for this program element which also funds university grants. The recommendation reflects a decrease of \$6,793,000—explained in principal Committee observations section of markup notes—to prevent further abuses in university research grants and to take advantage of expected savings. Another \$10,000,000 is added to finance the Defense Department's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research [DOD-EPSCoR].

Regarding DOD-EPSCoR, the Committee is concerned about recent OSD decisions to exclude certain States from competing for these funds. The Committee directs that none of the fiscal year

1991 funds appropriated for this program and no fiscal year 1992 funds for DOD-EPSCoR may be obligated or expended until the selection criteria are altered.

The Committee directs that all States eligible to compete for EPSCoR funds provided by the National Science Foundation also must be allowed to compete for DOD-EPSCoR funds. These States would be in addition to States already qualifying under the DOD criteria.

With respect to the overall program element, the Committee also wishes to encourage the Defense Department to utilize environmental research capabilities at research universities with established relationships with historically black colleges and universities.

Strategic technology.—The Committee recommends \$288,380,000, an increase of \$20,000,000 to the budget request and an equal amount above the House allowance for this program element under the auspices of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA].

This program element includes several major exploratory development projects in the areas of high performance computing and other information processing technologies, advanced materials, and computer-based manufacturing technologies.

The recommendation agrees with Senate-passed authorization to add \$20,000,000 for the final year of DARPA's initiative in concurrent engineering [DARPA-DICE]. DARPA-DICE is a computer-based weapons design system to link reliability and maintainability engineers with other experts to ensure logistics concerns are accommodated early in the design process. The Committee directs that \$20,000,000 of this program element is available only for DARPA-DICE.

The Committee also directs that \$23,365,000, the budget request, is only available for high temperature superconductivity research and that \$1,500,000 of that amount is available only for the second year of a multiyear, \$5,000,000 superconductive digital electronics project.

The Committee further directs that transfer of funds between separate projects within this program element be subject to established reprogramming procedures and thresholds. This language is intended to prevent major reallocations of resources among significant projects without prior congressional approval.

Concept evaluations.—The Committee agrees with the Senate-passed authorization to eliminate funds sought for unspecified research and development initiatives and duplicative concept studies. The House allowance also denied these funds.

Tactical technology.—This program element funds several major projects by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA] to develop advanced technologies for incorporation into future tactical systems. Research areas include technologies in naval warfare, armored warfare, target acquisition, and aeronautics.

The Committee provides \$120,900,000, an increase of \$3,000,000 to the budget request and an equal amount above the House allowance. Deleted is \$12,000,000 for the classified Zeal Dawn follow-on new start in the close combat technology project. This effort is pre-

mature since the basic Zeal Dawn project has not been completed and assessed to determine the viability of the developed technologies.

The Committee adds \$10,000,000 to initiate advanced development for ground combat identification systems designed to minimize the potential for friendly fire casualties on the battlefield. The recent, tragic experiences of such casualties during Operation Desert Storm highlight the need for such systems.

The Committee believes that DARPA should be the executive agent for the Defense Department's activities in this area. During Operation Desert Storm, the agency developed some basic identification-friend-or foe [IFF] systems for ground combat vehicles. The Committee directs that DARPA create a program which includes full participation by all the armed services and meets their unique and common requirements. OSD is directed to centralize all battlefield IFF programs in DARPA to eliminate duplication. The fiscal year 1993 budget request should be accompanied by an OSD report on the funding and scope of these activities programmed between fiscal years 1993-98.

The Committee also adds \$5,000,000 to complete a 2-year project to develop advanced electronic component technology under the acoustic charge transport project.

The Defense Department also is directed that transfer of any funds between separate projects within this program element will require prior Committee approval.

Integrated command and control technology/National Center of Excellence in Electronic Display Technology.—The Committee recommends \$36,800,000, an addition of \$1,300,000 to the budget request for this program to develop advanced hardware and software for communications, data transfer, and display systems. The increase is to fund development of a plan leading to the establishment of a National Center of Excellence in Electronic Display Technology. The study will be coordinated with DARPA and other appropriate Federal agencies and leading industry and research universities. The study should be completed and reported to the Committee no later than May 15, 1992.

The House allowance added \$100,000,000 to the budget request for this program element.

Materials and electronics technology.—The Committee agrees with the Senate-passed Defense authorization to add \$26,000,000 to continue DARPA participation in developing technology and manufacturing processes for continuous fiber metal matrix composites materials. The recommendation also adds \$5,000,000 to enhance development of diamond substrate materials as a new host material for advanced electronic components. The Committee provides a total of \$93,036,000, an increase of \$31,000,000 to the budget request but an amount which is \$50,000,000 less than the House allowance, for this program element.

Precompetitive technology development.—The Committee recommends an increase to the budget request of \$75,000,000 to fund the second year of a 2-year pilot project for new cooperative research and development ventures between DARPA and non-Federal participants. These new cooperative arrangements would be directed

at developing technologies critical to the national defense and the civilian economy.

The Committee directs that the requirements imposed in the Committee's report, and the Conference Report, for the Fiscal Year 1990 Defense Appropriations Act on DARPA cooperative ventures, also apply to the use of these funds. The Committee further directs that these funds are available only to finance cooperative arrangements authorized under section 2371 of title 10 of the United States Code.

The Committee continues to support this pilot project to explore innovative ways to promote critical technologies development. The Committee encourages DARPA to evaluate proposals from all interested parties in awarding these additional funds.

The Committee also is aware of a proposal to expand the use of these consortia beyond DARPA and to the individual armed services. The Committee notes that, when DARPA was granted the authority to enter into cooperative arrangements on a 2-year trial basis, Congress directed the Defense Secretary to report on his assessment of the successes and failures of the programs initiated under this authority. Congress also directed the Defense Secretary to recommend whether or not the authorizing legislation should be enacted into permanent law, with or without amendment, to include whether similar authorization for the military services or other defense agencies should be provided.

This report is due at the end of the trial period, which would be the end of fiscal year 1992 at the earliest. Until the end of this period, receipt of the Secretary's report, and Congress's evaluation of the entire experiment, the Committee believes it would be premature to expand the cooperative program to the military services. Accordingly, the Committee recommends a general provision which would restrict the Department's participation in these cooperative ventures only to the \$75,000,000 provided to DARPA.

With respect to potential consortia, the Committee supports efforts to exploit technology for sensor-based manufacturing applicable to high technology areas such as microelectronics. Good sensor development will assist industries to apply computer integrated manufacturing principles and to introduce concepts of expert and control systems necessary to ensure adaptable, flexible processes.

The Committee acknowledges the potential to bring industry, academia, and Government together in a partnership to develop such precompetitive technologies. Work on sensor-based manufacturing will support development of computer integrated flexible manufacturing.

The Committee recommends that DARPA give high priority to providing funding to support an institution capable of performing such research activity due to its highly advanced facilities, such as class 10 clean rooms, microelectronics processing centers, manufacturing research facilities, microlithography research activities, and preexisting programs of collaboration with leading industry and university consortia research efforts.

Defense Nuclear Agency [DNA].—DNA is the Defense agency responsible for most of the Department's nuclear weapons development and testing activities. The Committee recommends \$290,142,000, a reduction of \$150,999,000 to the budget request and

an amount which is \$50,999,000 below the House allowance. The recommended reduction transfers \$105,046,000 to the strategic defense initiative [SDI] program, since these activities primarily support the development of SDI systems and technologies.

The 10 projects and amounts to be transferred are: Project AC/Optical Hardening, \$10,400,000; Project AF/Operate Through Electronics, \$1,690,000; Project AF/Nuclear Environments, \$3,596,000; Project AF/Electronic Hardening, \$12,680,000; Project AF/Nuclear Optical Background, \$12,680,000; Project AJ/Impulse Laser Lethality, \$100,000; Project AJ/Thermal Laser Lethality, \$400,000; Project AJ/Neutral Particle Beam Lethality \$500,000; Project AJ/Kinetic Energy Lethality, \$22,000,000; Project AI/Systems Hardening, \$41,000,000.

Other recommended reductions are as follows:

One, \$12,400,000 for new start, Divine Archer underground nuclear test [UGT] support activities; these activities are premature since major changes to the test plan and configuration are being considered, pending analysis during the next year of test results available late in fiscal year 1991;

Two, \$27,556,000 to increase Mighty Uncle UGT support activities from the current fiscal year level of \$2,000,000; \$2,000,000 is provided for fiscal year 1992 to maintain planning efforts; the Mighty Uncle increase is premature since it is a major SDI-related test which could be impacted by the Senate recommended changes to the SDI program;

Three, \$1,000,000 for the 21st century Survivability and security project, an unjustified, premature study to examine concepts for 21st century theater nuclear weapons [TNW]; current TNW modernization and deployment programs are sufficiently uncertain as to make predicting the future at this time a futile waste of money;

Four, \$3,997,000 for duplicative policy studies and assessments which represent a diversion away from DNA's central responsibilities in the nuclear weapons effects, weapons technologies, and verification technology areas; funds are eliminated from these projects: (a) strategic policy; (b) nonstrategic policy; (c) nonstrategic assessments; (d) support of RDT&E headquarters;

The Committee directs OSD to reassess DNA's role in these activities and determine whether other Pentagon organizations are better suited and more appropriate to undertake them, and to report back to the Congress with the fiscal year 1993 budget request. Funds also are eliminated for undefined conferences;

Five, \$500,000 for studies on a superhard mobile ICBM launcher [HML], which would be an alternative to the HML proposed for the small ICBM; this study is unjustified, since the fielding status of the small ICBM is in doubt because no deployment funds are included in the FYDP; and

Six, \$500,000 for concept design, test, and other activities for terminal defense of ICBM fields using automatically fired explosively formed projectiles [CASTLE] or small missiles [SHORTSTOP]; such efforts are unjustified in view of the major investments in missile defense being made in the strategic and theater missile defense initiatives.

Joint DOD-DOE munitions technology development.—The Committee recommends \$20,000,000, an increase of \$9,740,000 to the

budget request and an equal amount above the House allowance, for this joint Defense-Energy Department program to develop advanced munitions technologies. This program capitalizes on the nuclear weapons design expertise of the three Energy Department national weapons laboratories. Such techniques are applied to design more effective conventional munitions and weapons technologies.

Experimental evaluation of major innovative technologies [EEMIT].—The Committee approves \$277,960,000 a reduction of \$11,740,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$53,260,000 above the House allowance. The recommendation includes the following actions:

One, deletes \$7,640,000 for the Vehicle Survivability Program [VSP] in the close combat project; VSP is a low priority to the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and the Army has yet to do a comprehensive operational study to assess how VSP technologies would be employed on the battlefield;

Also, VSP is not part of the Army's baseline armored systems modernization program, casting further doubt as to its ultimate utility;

Two, deletes \$2,000,000 from the close combat project to deny a new start on a smart mine which lacks any operational requirement;

Three, deletes \$3,000,000 for the EHF communications concepts/technologies effort in the Advanced Space Technology Program [ASTP] project; this new start development activity is premature, since it is trying to develop technologies to replace the Milstar satellite system, which has yet to be deployed;

Also, most of the activity is underfunded by about \$150,000,000, and the armed services have not budgeted for their participation in what is supposed to be a joint endeavor;

Four, deletes \$800,000 in the ASTP project identified as unneeded for known program requirements;

Five, adds \$1,200,000 to the ASTP project to continue the hyper-spectral sensor technology space object tracking project; and

Six, adds \$500,000 for the classified tinsel Moon project.

The Committee directs no Air Force funds may be transferred to the Thirsty Saber autonomous weapons concepts demonstration project without prior Committee approval. In addition, transfer of any funds between separate projects within program this element is required to receive prior Committee approval.

The Committee also understands that DARPA is considering adding, through an internal reallocation, \$15,000,000 to the \$20,800,000 already budgeted in fiscal year 1992 for advanced simulation efforts. DARPA is directed to identify to the Committee the sources of the additional funds 30 days in advance of any reallocation.

Finally, with respect to the advanced submarine technology [subtech] program, the Committee urges continued development effort in advanced materials directed to the application of nonmetallic, thick section composites to submarine pressure hulls and related structure.

The Committee also notes that DARPA is allocating \$55,000,000 for the subtech project and strongly urges the agency to consider allocating an additional \$3,000,000 within that amount for develop-

ment of fuel cell technology for powering both unmanned underwater vehicles as well as larger manned submarines.

Balanced technology initiative [BTI].—BTI develops technologies to enhance U.S. conventional war-fighting capabilities. It concentrates on advanced technologies, such as new warhead and gun technologies, targeting sensors, and precision-guided weapons.

The Committee allocates \$154,968,000, a reduction of \$36,600,000 to the budget request. BTI has suffered from, among other problems, a lack of firm program plans and internal budget allocations. Program management has improved, but significant problems persist. The Committee tries to address them by:

One, denying \$18,300,000 for the battalion targeting system [BTS], a project which has changed dramatically since the budget request was submitted; BTS now lacks a firm cost estimate, funding profile, project definition, implementation plan, and acquisition strategy;

The project manager and executing agency have changed, and there is an entirely new project concept; Congress should review these changes in the next budget cycle before committing funds;

Two, deferring \$8,000,000 requested for phase II of the quiet night avionics for special operations project and denying another \$5,000,000 of the total BTI request; these latter funds should be replaced by \$5,000,000 allocated in the current fiscal year to begin quiet night phase II without congressional permission;

Quiet Night II was a new start not identified by the BTI program, nor approved by Congress, during the fiscal year 1991 review; the project is underfunded in fiscal year 1992; there are no funds in the FYDP to insert the products of either phase II or phase I into special operations aircraft;

Three, deleting \$1,800,000 identified as unneeded in the fiber optic weapons project; and

Four, eliminating \$3,500,000 sought for undefined Project Development and unspecified new projects/emerging requirements.

The Committee believes that the denied projects are symptomatic of the problems continuing to beset the BTI program. Major projects lack firm development plans. Funds appropriated for certain purposes are diverted to begin new efforts without prior congressional approval. Projects are undertaken with no assurance that results actually will be inserted into weapons systems to enhance operational capabilities. Costly new projects are based on weak justification and little assurance they do not duplicate other activities within the Defense Department.

In addition, the technical, cost, and schedule performance of projects has been inconsistent, at best. For example, the Committee has been informed that the BTI program consumed between \$25,000,000 and \$35,000,000 on an infrared countermeasures project only to discover a contractor demonstrated poor cost, schedule, and technical performance, and allegedly withheld such information from program management.

Another endeavor, the electro-optic countermeasures/targeting project is being reconsidered since the selected system concept has been declared not viable. The emerging system is too heavy, and a cost overrun is contemplated.

This history gives the Committee little confidence in BTI. Nevertheless, the Committee believes the basic underlying premises of BTI remain valid—if program execution actually improves enough so these laudable objectives can be accomplished. The Committee urges the Defense Department to increase its oversight of the program so its potential can be fulfilled. The Committee warns that continued support for BTI is contingent upon demonstrated resolution of the previously highlighted problems.

To encourage this resolution, the Committee directs several changes in the program.

First, the Committee directs that no commitment of funds for any new start project or significant expansion of project scope may be made unless that project is identified in the annual budget request for the first fiscal year in which funds are required.

Second, each BTI project seeking funds in fiscal year 1993 must be accompanied by a signed memoranda of agreement between BTI and at least one of the military services or Defense agencies that, should the project achieve its performance and cost objectives, the service or agency will fully fund any necessary continued development and procurement. The Committee directs that each memorandum include a certification that a firm transition plan exists between BTI and the service or agency, and that the service or agency has included in its fiscal year 1993 budget request and fiscal years 1993–98 FYDP full funding for any continuation activities.

Third, any transfer of funds between separate projects within the BTI program element is subject to prior Committee approval.

To ensure that meritorious BTI projects are fully supported, the Committee directs that the following amounts are available only for these particular projects: (a) \$35,000,000 for the enhanced kinetic energy munition [X-Rod]; (b) \$13,400,000 for the Navy electrothermal gun; (c) \$13,800,000 for the short-range antitank weapon; (d) \$7,300,000 for the advanced tactical radio technology (Speak-easy) project; (e) \$8,900,000 for Damocles; and (f) \$6,000,000 for the advanced mine system.

The Committee also is aware of a proposal for BTI to sponsor a 35 mm case telescope gun project as a possible upgrade to the Phalanx close-in-weapon system for surface ships. The case telescope gun technology may have the potential to increase the rate of fire and firepower of the Phalanx. Nevertheless, BTI is funding other gun enhancement projects, and the justification for funding a case telescope gun has not been made clear.

The Secretary of the Navy is directed to submit with the fiscal year 1993 budget request a report containing the service's plans for improving ship air defenses in the next 15 years and a comparison of the cost-effectiveness of the 35 mm case telescope gun technology with other ship defense alternatives. The Director of BTI is directed to assess the advantages and disadvantages of the case gun technology development project as a candidate for BTI funding in the fiscal year 1993 budget and also report back to the Committee with the budget submission.

The House allowance denied all funds for the balanced technology initiative.

Verification technology demonstration.—The Committee approves \$71,980,000, a decrease of \$11,250,000 to the budget request and an

equal amount below the House allowance, for this program to develop technologies for monitoring and verifying compliance with arms control agreements. The reduction defers one-half of the funds sought for the chemical weapons verification project since the program will not be definitized until midfiscal year 1992.

Air defense initiative [ADI].—The Committee recommends \$164,000,000, a reduction of \$109,000,000 to the budget request. This program develops advanced air defense and antisubmarine warfare technologies to defend the United States homeland from the Soviet cruise missile and bomber threat and forward deployed units from regional threats.

The recommendation is \$41,000,000 above the House allowance, which provided \$123,000,000 but transferred \$41,000,000 from ADI to the Navy for related antisubmarine warfare activities. The House allowance also mandated that \$54,000,000 of ADI funds only be used for continued development of an airship.

The Committee recommendation deletes projects identified as a lower priority by OSD. The Committee also directs that of the remaining funds, the budget request amount of \$19,300,000 is available only for the mountain top experiment. Any activities for this project will require prior approval by the Committee. The Committee further directs that \$33,000,000 of the remaining funds are available only for classified project E.

The Committee also has been informed that recent developments in airborne radar technologies indicate that large sensor platforms such as an airship are far less viable as ADI platforms than previously considered. Therefore, under current budget conditions, the Committee does not believe that the large expense to continue airship development is justified. The Committee prohibits any ADI funds from being used for the airship project.

The Committee understands, however, that the airship is being considered for another role in the Federal Government's drug interdiction activities, where it may have a more direct and useful application. The Committee suggests that OSD consider funding any continued airship development or procurement, if justified, out of counternarcotics funds.

The Committee notes that a number of countries possess intercontinental aircraft capable of delivering nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction against the United States. U.S. air defenses are modest at best, as evidenced by the landing of a Cuban Mig at Homestead Air Force Base earlier this year without being detected. The Committee also notes that the administration's fiscal year 1992 request for the strategic defense initiative was approximately 20 times larger than its request for the air defense initiative. Accordingly, the Committee strongly recommends that the Department should address the question of the airbreathing threat to the United States and recommend a realistic program to address this threat and reduce the asymmetry in our defensive efforts.

Nonacoustic antisubmarine warfare [NAASW].—This program element funds a coordinated, focused effort managed by OSD to explore critical nonacoustic ASW technologies. Participants include the Navy, Defense Agencies, Energy Department national laboratories, other Federal organizations, and certain NATO allies. The recommendation adds \$30,000,000 to the budget request for OSD to

continue this effort at the current fiscal year appropriated level. This amount includes \$12,397,000 transferred from the Navy and \$17,603,000 in additional funds.

The Committee directs that ATD Project 111 be fully funded at the budget request amount.

The House allowance includes \$100,000,000 for this program element.

Joint standoff weapons [JSOW] program.—This program performed concept definition and advanced technology development for the long-range conventional standoff weapon. That project has been canceled, and the program now wants to continue guidance and mission planning technology efforts as hypothetical upgrades to current and developing cruise missiles. The effort duplicates other work, is unnecessary, and is underfunded. The Committee denies the requested \$20,000,000 and recommends terminating this effort. The House allowance also eliminated all JSOW program funds.

CINC C² initiatives.—In the past, this program has developed video systems, software, aircraft simulators, architectures and master plans, and technical requirements documents. These functions appear to duplicate efforts throughout the Defense Department.

The Committee believes the Joint Chiefs of Staff should not be in the research and development business and should obtain these services from existing military RDT&E or support organizations. This project also suffers from low expenditures, indicating work is not being accomplished. The \$1,803,000 request is denied. The House allowance included these funds.

Joint remotely piloted vehicles [RPV] program.—The Committee provides \$70,513,000, an increase of \$1,951,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$15,787,000 below the House allowance, for this program to develop unmanned aerial vehicles [UAV] and their associated payloads and control systems.

The action deletes \$2,000,000 identified by OSD as no longer needed for the purposes originally requested, and \$3,549,000 to begin the short-range block III RPV system. The block III is premature since the block I production configuration may not be finalized until June 1992 and most of the design, fabrication, and test of block II is scheduled for fiscal years 1993 and 1994. Initiating block III in fiscal year 1992 accepts excessive concurrency in a complex integration program.

Added is \$7,500,000 to begin in fiscal year 1992 a demonstration and test program for tilt-rotor UAV technology. This amount will permit actual technology demonstrations to begin after a 4-month study period, instead of waiting until fiscal year 1993. The funds provided are sufficient to support the winning contractor in the tilt-rotor UAV competition.

The Committee directs that \$1,200,000 of the funds in the interoperability/commonality project shall be available only to continue development of a common automatic recovery system initially tailored for competing joint short-range candidate UAV's. Ultimately a common system should support multiple applications.

The Committee also directs that no funds may be obligated or expended during fiscal year 1992 for any tactical endurance UAV activities.

The Committee also prohibits use of any Defense Department funds to maintain or employ systems proposed by the ultimately unsuccessful team in the short-range RPV competition. The Committee is distressed that the joint RPV program office, by suggesting such an arrangement, is contributing to proliferation of non-common RPV systems which do not satisfy established joint requirements. The Committee warns the joint program office that its mission is to accomplish exactly the opposite objective.

The Committee further is concerned that the joint program office has failed to allocate sufficient funds in its annual budget request and spending plans for desired activities. The Committee further warns the program office it will be unwilling in the future to provide relief for such deficient budgeting. The Committee directs that the fiscal year 1993 budget request be accompanied by a certification from the Secretary of Defense that the joint RPV program is funded fully in each fiscal year of the fiscal years 1993-98 future years defense program for RDT&E and procurement.

The Committee also wishes to express its concern about undue delays in fielding UAV systems which meet joint requirements. The prospect of inappropriately long RDT&E activities would deny useful capabilities to our Armed Forces.

Special operations tactical systems development; general support—Assistant Secretary of Defense, special operations/low intensity conflict.—These program elements fund special studies and research and development on advanced technologies and systems to enhance special operations forces [SOF] capabilities.

The Committee adds \$2,000,000 to the budget request and an equal amount above the House allowance to provide the Assistant Secretary of Defense (special operations/low intensity conflict) a capability for analytical general support similar to that afforded other Assistant Secretaries of Defense. The amount is the same as that provided in the current fiscal year for the same purposes.

The Committee recommends \$172,676,000, a reduction of \$21,614,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$34,574,000 below the House allowance, for SOF tactical systems development. The Committee also directs that any transfer of funds between separate projects within these program elements be subject to prior Committee approval.

This recommendation makes the following adjustments:

One, adds \$3,800,000 to fully fund fiscal year 1992 efforts to develop a stabilized weapons platform for the coastal patrol boats;

Two, cuts \$2,800,000 identified by OSD as excess to fiscal year 1992 requirements for the advanced seal delivery system;

Three, deletes \$19,100,000 from the MC-130H combat talon II project identified by OSD as unneeded due to the indefinite deferral of the CDAS detection avoidance system;

Four, deletes \$16,100,000 from funds in the entire tactical systems program element because a similar amount of current fiscal year funds in the combat talon II project are available due to suspended development efforts;

Five, defers \$1,414,000 for the special operations media system [SOMS] A&B subproject under the psychological operations project. SOMS A and B are fixed-vans, trucks, and high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles containing a mix of television and radio production and transmission capabilities to conduct propaganda worldwide or in a particular theater.

Neither system has a firm operational requirement, life cycle cost estimate, or acquisition strategy; funds are deferred so Congress can review these issues in the next budget cycle before committing funds.

Six, adds \$4,000,000 to fully fund fiscal year 1992 development of the joint advanced special operations radio system [JASORS].

Seven, adds \$10,000,000 for the design and selection of a prototype Mark-V fast patrol boat (PB MK-5) for special operations SEAL insertion missions.

The Committee desires the U.S. Special Operations Command [USSOCOM] to proceed expeditiously to develop and field a fast SEAL insertion boat no later than fiscal year 1994. The \$10,000,000 recommended by the Committee should be used for the following purposes: to establish a Mark-V program office, to develop a technical data package, to complete a market survey and selection of competitive designs, to solicit bids from qualified U.S. manufacturers through an expedited request for proposal process, to develop a comprehensive acquisition strategy, and to award a contract for a prototype boat.

The Committee expects that all of these activities will be completed in fiscal year 1992 so that a full prototype testing program can be funded and carried out in fiscal year 1993 and a candidate Mark-V boat chosen. Special Operations Command is directed to provide full funding in the fiscal years 1993-98 FYDP for any RDT&E, procurement, military construction, and operations and maintenance that will be required for the Mark-V boat.

The Committee recognizes the special operations requirement for a SEAL insertion boat that is both fast and air transportable.

Therefore, the Committee directs that the Special Operations Command lease or acquire a Mark-V prototype boat(s), no later than September 1, 1992, for use as a testbed in the development of the Mark-V technical data package. Funds for this purpose are included as part of the Committee's recommendation for fiscal year 1992.

The Committee also directs that USSOCOM ensure that its requirement for the PB MK-5 include the drug interdiction mission and that testing of the boat include operations in Andean riverine environments.

Finally, the Committee notes that the U.S. Special Operations Command [USSOCOM] is restructuring the interactive defensive avionics system [IDAS] project. The Committee expects that the use of current airlift aircraft defensive systems and infrared countermeasures already under development will be emphasized before the initiation of new technology or systems development. A detailed plan, including total costs and future years defense program funding status, for the restructured IDAS project must be submitted to the Committee 30 days before obligation of fiscal year 1992 funds.

Manufacturing technology.—Consistent with the Senate-passed defense authorization, the Committee approves \$157,000,000 in the "Defense agencies RDT&E" account for a consolidated manufacturing technology program under the direction of the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The House provided \$50,000,000 for such a program in addition to funding separate activities in each of the armed services.

The Committee's recommendation transfers \$97,000,000 from the industrial preparedness program elements of the individual services into the consolidated program. This consolidated program is intended to increase institutional support for defense manufacturing technology programs and to insure better coordination and integration of these activities.

Due to overall budget constraints, the Committee is unable to provide another \$93,000,000 to fund the authorization recommendation of \$250,000,000 for the consolidated program.

The Committee directs the following allocations within the consolidated program: (1) the budget request only for continuing an effort to enhance U.S. manufacturing base capabilities to produce precision optics for sights and visual equipment, as part of the weapons and tracked combat vehicles project transferred from the Army; (2) \$3,000,000 only for an ongoing project transferred from the Navy to develop manufacturing technologies for fabrication of submarine propulsors, design and manufacturing of lightweight ship structures, and repair of aircraft carrier valves and catapult launch systems.

Integrated diagnostics.—Integrated diagnostics is a concept for designing maintenance capability for weapon systems as a complete package, instead of as individual, related components, such as failure sensors, automatic test equipment, and technical manuals. The Committee recommends \$7,401,000 for the fiscal year 1992 program, a reduction of \$3,350,000 to the budget request and an equal amount below the House allowance. The recommendation fully funds a planned demonstration on the Abrams tank which should demonstrate the merit of this technology, but was delayed for a year. The recommendation also fully funds technical support efforts and provides \$100,000, the fiscal year 1991 amount, to permit further planning and definition of a Navy experiment.

NATO research and development.—The Committee allocates \$19,256,000, a reduction of \$21,700,000 to the budget request for this program element to fund cooperative research and development programs with our NATO and major non-NATO allies. The House allowance eliminated all requested funds.

The Committee denies funds for four new start projects, one of which was canceled after the budget was submitted. The reductions are:

One, \$12,200,000 for the alternate multimode seeker demonstration, which was canceled by the Federal Republic of Germany and the U.S. Army;

Two, \$3,500,000 for the Surface-to-Air Missile Command Center, which the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization has stated it would fund;

Three, \$4,000,000 for the supercockpit interface project, which duplicates work already accomplished under the pilot's associate project in DARPA; and

Four, \$2,000,000 for the automatic ship classification project, which the U.S. Navy says has not progressed beyond the initial planning stage since late 1987.

The Committee encourages Israel, as a major non-NATO ally eligible to participate in this program, to submit programs for evaluation.

Flexible computer integrated manufacturing [FCIM] systems programs.—The Committee adds \$27,000,000 to the budget request for several initiatives to enhance manufacturing processes through the integration of computer controls and sophisticated production equipment.

The Committee recommends bill language to allocate \$4,000,000 of the increase only for a grant to the Institute for Advanced Flexible Manufacturing Systems to continue its ongoing activities. The Committee directs that these funds are available only for this grant, which must be administered by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency through the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences.

In addition, the Committee has previously supported development of the Navy's Rapid Acquisition of Manufactured Parts [RAMP] Program as a centerpiece of efforts to develop improved manufacturing procedures in depots and industrial facilities. As a result of this support, capabilities available through RAMP and the flexible computer integrated manufacturing [FCIM] technology developed under RAMP now offer techniques for reducing costs and production lead time associated with a wide variety of Defense Department depot level operations.

To capitalize on advances already achieved, the Committee recommends another \$23,000,000 for further development and application of FCIM. Of this amount, the Committee directs that \$11,500,000 will be made available to the Secretary of the Navy only for continuation of RAMP and for establishing a RAMP-FCIM Center for Manufacturing Excellence. The Committee further directs that the remaining \$11,500,000 will be made available to the Secretary of the Army only for application of RAMP-FCIM technology to selected Army depots. The Committee also recommends bill language to accomplish this direction.

The House allowance includes only \$7,500,000 in the Navy RDT&E account for the RAMP program.

Critical Technologies Institute.—The Committee recommends bill language to require the obligation, within 90 days after enactment of the fiscal year 1992 funding measure of \$5,000,000 in fiscal year 1991 funds provided for a Critical Technologies Institute. This Institute was funded to assist the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy in planning and implementing development of critical technologies related to national security and global economic competitiveness.

National defense science and engineering graduate fellowships.—The Committee recommends a general provision repeating section 8142 of the fiscal year 1989 defense appropriations measure, to provide \$10,000,000 for the National Defense Science and Engineering

Graduate Fellowships Program. Under the provision, 50 percent of the funds would be made available from the University Research Initiatives Program in the "Defense agencies RDT&E" account and the balance would be derived from amounts available in all the Defense Research Sciences Program elements under the entire RDT&E title of the fiscal year 1992 act.

Strategic environmental research and development program [SERDP].—Last year the Committee provided \$150,000,000 for fiscal year 1991 to support the new strategic environmental research and development program in the Defense Department. This program was established by Congress last year to increase the department's contributions to countering major environmental threats facing the Nation and the global environment.

Due to planning, organizational, and execution delays, the Committee understands that none of the fiscal year 1991 funds actually will be obligated until fiscal year 1992. The Committee supports the goals of SERDP, but believes that this delay obviates the need to provide additional funding for next fiscal year. The Committee looks forward to a well-executed effort next year to create the foundation for the appropriation of new budget authority in fiscal year 1993.

Recognizing that final plans still are being formulated for the fiscal year 1991 funds, the Committee wishes to exercise appropriate oversight over such an important initiative. Accordingly, the Committee directs that no funds for SERDP may be obligated or expended until 30 days after the congressional defense committees receive a report listing the specific projects and dollars amounts to be to be supported next fiscal year.

The Committee also has been informed that certain projects contemplated for inclusion in SERDP involve the development of satellite hardware or sensors. Since hardware development was not within the original scope of SERDP, the Committee is concerned that the military services may be using this program as a funding source for lower priority projects.

The Committee observes that this tactic has contributed to diminishing the validity of several other OSD development programs. The Committee does not wish to see history repeat itself with respect to the strategic environmental research and development program.

The Committee further directs that \$3,000,000 of the fiscal year 1991 funds shall be available only to provide additional supercomputer processing capacity for the SERDP from an existing facility which is geographically situated to provide the required staff necessary to ensure uninterrupted service. This facility also must be able to dedicate 13,000 central processing unit [CPU] hours of operational activity for an indefinite number of years in order to guarantee uninterrupted availability of the system. The system should have the capability of providing data management/data visualization technology, access to geographic information systems [GIS] methodology, as well as high speed computing capacity.

The Committee directs that this allocation is in addition to the direction contained in its fiscal year 1991 report mandating that \$25,000,000 of fiscal year 1991 SERDP funds are available only for establishment of an Arctic region supercomputing center to sup-

port research by the Defense Department and other Federal agencies and the academic community.

The Committee also recommends bill language to clarify guidance contained in the conference report on the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1991, with respect to the Arctic Region Supercomputing Center. The Committee believes that the planned Arctic Region Center will play a key role in meeting program goals in the areas of global warming and Arctic change.

As suggested in the Senate-passed, and conference report-endorsed, report on the fiscal year 1991 defense funding measure, other DOD research activities also could benefit from the availability of this supercomputer center. The Director, defense research and engineering, shall report the acquisition plan and schedule for the supercomputer for the Arctic Region Center not later than February 15, 1992.

Antisubmarine warfare signal processing techniques.—The Committee recognizes certain noteworthy efforts in the field of sophisticated computationally intensive ASW signal processing techniques and encourages the Defense Department to give high priority consideration to supporting this initiative with fiscal year 1992 funds.

National defense stockpile transaction fund grants for materials research and development.—The Committee is aware of a proposal to expand the authorities under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act to permit use of the national defense stockpile transaction fund to finance grants or contracts for research regarding the development or production of advanced strategic and critical materials.

Since the national defense stockpile transaction fund is not subject to annual appropriations, the Committee concludes that the use of fund assets for such grants represents a form of back door spending for research purposes. The Committee objects to this financing mechanism and has recommended a general provision preventing its implementation.

The Committee understands that the proposal for initial use of this financing mechanism involves a total of \$25,000,000. Nevertheless, the prospect of much larger amounts becoming available in the future from the transaction fund raises a serious concern about Congress losing control over these funds outside of the annual appropriations process.

The Committee believes that much tighter congressional control is needed over these funds than simply an annual reporting requirement, as currently proposed. The proper mechanism for such control is the annual appropriations process, in the Committee's opinion.

Department of Defense—Department of Energy joint development of critical defense technologies.—The Committee understands that the Defense and Energy Departments are contemplating expansion of their joint program in munitions technologies development to cooperate in research and development of other critical defense technologies. The Committee recognizes the unique talents of the Energy Department's national weapons laboratories and the potential which exists to apply these talents in an expanded joint program.

However, the Committee is reluctant to initiate such an expanded program in fiscal year 1992 due to a concern about the lack of a source for future year funding. The Committee has been informed no funds are included in the current future years defense program, despite the projection that the Defense Department share is to be \$30,000,000 annually. The availability of funds within the Energy Department also is a large uncertainty.

The Committee observes these are unfavorable fiscal times in which to begin new initiatives which will compete for funds with higher priority activities.

The Committee directs that the next budget request be accompanied by a detailed statement of the status of efforts to create this new joint program. This statement should include the following information: (1) specific identification of the projects to be undertaken in the first year of any such program; (2) the future years defense program and total costs of each project; (3) the funding contributions by each department for each project; (4) a certification that each year of the future years defense program is fully funded in both departments for their respective shares; (5) the specific military requirement for each project and an explanation of why DOD and DOE investments in developing these technologies are insufficient without the joint program; and (6) a certification that each particular project does not duplicate research already underway in other in DOD or DOE programs.

Mobile offshore base analysis.—The Committee has been informed of a new approach to afloat prepositioning called mobile offshore bases [MOBS]. This approach would use mobile offshore platforms linked together to preposition heavy equipment and material in strategic locations around the world, including the Middle East.

The Committee agrees that this approach should be examined in the context of the mobility requirements study by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This concept should be evaluated in the overall context of forward basing and prepositioning, maritime prepositioning, and developing airlift and sealift capabilities. The Committee directs that the cost effectiveness and strategic utility of the MOBS concept be evaluated as part of the JCS mobility requirements study. The Committee expects that any additional effort to evaluate MOBS can be accommodated within existing funds already allocated for the JCS study.

Manufacturing technology/Sematech.—The Committee recommendation for the manufacturing technology program element managed by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA] includes the requested funding of \$100,000,000 to fund the semiconductor manufacturing technology [Sematech] consortium in fiscal year 1992. Sematech was formed and first received Department of Defense [DOD] funding in 1988. Sematech was planned as a three-phase, 5-year approach to regaining world leadership in semiconductor manufacturing. Sematech stated "its goal is to ensure the United States of a world-leading manufacturing capability with exclusively domestic content by 1993." DARPA oversees Sematech activities and has stated that the Sematech program is on schedule. Despite supposedly achieving its objectives, Sematech already has initiated post-phase three activities using fiscal year 1991 funds. Additional follow-on activities are planned in fiscal

year 1992. The DOD has budgeted substantial funds for Sematech in each year of the fiscal years 1992-97 future years defense program [FYDP]. The Committee is concerned that this 5-year effort may become an indefinitely funded program.

The DOD will have invested \$500,000,000 in Sematech by the end of fiscal year 1992. Information provided by the General Accounting Office [GAO] raises questions about the benefits of Sematech to DOD and the U.S. semiconductor manufacturing industry. As Sematech reaches this 5-year mark, the Committee believes an independent assessment of what taxpayers have received for their first \$500,000,000 is required.

The assessment should be conducted by the GAO and should evaluate the accomplishments of Sematech relative to the objectives and goals used to justify its formation and initial Defense Department funding. The study should include the following: (1) data on U.S. market share in semiconductor manufacturing, manufacturing materials, manufacturing equipment by type, and other areas which allow assessment of Sematech's impact on U.S. semiconductor manufacturing competitiveness; (2) evaluation of technology transfer from Sematech to Sematech member companies and to U.S. semiconductor manufacturing companies not participating in Sematech; (3) assessment of Sematech impact on U.S. semiconductor manufacturing companies not participating in Sematech; (5) any additional costs of Sematech to the Government through DOD reimbursement of Sematech member contributions; and (6) estimation of the current cost to produce comparable semiconductor components in the United States and abroad, providing insight on Sematech's impact on manufacturing processes.

Advanced short take-off and vertical landing [ASTOVL] aircraft.—The Committee has been informed about a proposal to renew development by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA] of a supersonic aircraft capable of short takeoffs and vertical landings. The Committee recognizes the potential war fighting advantages such an aircraft could possess. However, the Committee understands that DARPA terminated such an effort last year due to the estimated program cost of \$1,000,000,000 just to demonstrate the necessary technologies.

The Committee understands further that this program still warrants a low priority within DARPA.

The Committee already has expressed concern about the affordability of the Naval aviation program and knows that the Marine Corps is struggling to provide adequate resources to upgrade its current vertical takeoff and landing aircraft, the AV-8B Harrier. The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency also operates within a constrained fiscal environment. The Committee questions whether any of these components, given other priorities, can afford a costly ASTOVL program in the future years defense program.

Nevertheless, the Committee would find it helpful to receive additional information about the proposed ASTOVL program and directs OSD to submit such data to Congress during next year's budget cycle.

This information should include: (a) any firm, validated military requirement existing in any of the military services for such an aircraft; (b) the total and fiscal years 1993-98 costs to accomplish

the ASTOVL program, including the amounts each service and DARPA will budget for this activity in each year; (c) a proposed development schedule; (d) an assessment of the principal technical risks of the program; (e) a clear statement of, and justification for, the program's priority within each of the services and DARPA; (f) the RDT&E and procurement programs each service would be willing to forego to fund the ASTOVL activity; and (g) a comparison of the operational advantages and disadvantages of such an aircraft with current and new aircraft programs already contemplated by the Defense Department. This comparison should include the advanced tactical fighter, the AX, the F/A-18E/F, and the advanced AV-8B Harrier.

Software engineering, manufacturing, and management technologies.—The Committee is concerned about the pervasive nature of critical technologies included in both the May 1991 Department of Defense critical technologies plan and a March 1991 report compiled by the national critical technologies plan [NCTP]. These technologies strengthen our national security and enhance domestic industrial competitiveness. Two technologies included in both reports are software engineering and manufacturing technology.

Since information and manufacturing technologies play an integral role in our defense-oriented industries, it is important to identify weaknesses in these technologies and implement strategies to address them. The Committee also recognizes the lack of adequately trained engineers to support America's need to improve its productivity through practical and applied technologies, which will also enhance our national security.

To address this problem, the Committee has recommended that additional support be provided for software engineering and manufacturing technologies initiatives. One innovative proposal which the Committee believes is worthy of consideration is a joint industry-academic program which provides graduate students with an opportunity to work in corporate laboratories to solve those software and manufacturing problems cited in both the critical technologies plan and the NCTP.

Advanced multichip modules.—The Committee has recommended an additional \$8,000,000 allocated between the Defense research sciences and Materials and Electronics Technology Program elements for development of advanced multichip module and diamond substrate technologies. The Committee recognizes the potential of these advanced electronics technologies to increase the processing capabilities and reliability of military avionics.

The Committee encourages the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to continue to support this important technology effort in the future years defense program.

Photolithography.—The Committee recognizes that the semiconductor industry, as the foundation of the electronics industry, is essential to the economic and military security of the United States. The development of advanced lithography programs, including x ray, deep ultraviolet, and free-electron laser [FEL], are essential to continued United States competitiveness in microelectronics. The Committee supports expeditious action toward the development of a roadmap to clearly establish program goals, achievable mile-

stones, and priorities for investments in microelectronics process development.

House actions not agreed to.—The Committee disagrees with the following recommendations contained in the House allowance:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Technical support to USD(A)	41,176	38,176	41,176		+ 3,000
Superconductive magnetic energy storage		40,000			- 40,000
Medical free electron laser	20,000	30,000	20,000		- 10,000
Focus Hope		20,000			- 20,000
Environmental special project		20,000			- 20,000
DOD environmental studies		10,000			- 10,000
Relocatable Target Detection Technology Program	10,000	28,000	10,000		- 18,000
Advanced submarine technology		75,000			- 75,000
Cooperative DOD/VA medical research		20,000			- 20,000
Medical research		30,000			- 30,000
Consolidated DOD software initiative	6,932	26,932	6,932		- 20,000
Special operations advanced technology development	13,700	16,700	13,700		- 3,000
Physical security equipment	39,926	60,926	39,926		- 21,000
Classified Program—C ³ I	5,300	10,300	5,300		- 5,000
AIM-9 Consolidated Program	43,781	70,139	43,781		- 26,358
Special operations intelligence systems development	10,637	15,837	10,637		- 5,200
SOF operational enhancements	54,190	21,893	54,190		+ 32,297
Special operations forces (transfer fr. AF)		1,991			- 1,991
Defense reconnaissance support activities	52,876	74,876	52,876		- 22,000
General support to C ³ I		15,000			- 15,000
Defense Technical Information Center		22,500			- 22,500
Information analysis centers		5,500			- 5,500
Industrial preparedness		17,000			- 17,000

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Senate compared with--	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL DEF AG					
TECHNOLOGY BASE					
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES.....	88,290	108,290	95,058	+6,768	-13,232
IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH.....	2,206	2,206	6,206	+4,000	+4,000
MILITARY NURSING RESEARCH.....	--	--	1,000	+1,000	+1,000
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES.....	87,373	182,373	90,580	+3,207	-91,793
HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES (HBCU).....	--	--	15,000	+15,000	+15,000
OTHER TECH BASE UNIVERSITY GRANTS.....	--	--	-18,545	-18,545	-18,545
DOD GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP TRAINING.....	--	--	--	--	--
K-12 EDUCATION PROGRAMS.....	--	--	--	--	--
ENGINEERING - TRAINING INITIATIVE.....	--	--	--	--	--
U.S. JAPAN MANAGEMENT TRAINING.....	--	--	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
HBCU/MI S & E EDUCATION SUPPORT.....	--	--	--	--	--
RESEARCH PROJECTS.....	--	--	--	--	--
HF ACTIVE AURAL RESEARCH PROGRAM.....	--	--	--	--	--
CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY CENTER.....	--	--	--	--	--
SUPERCONDUCTIVE MAGNETIC ENERGY STORAGE.....	--	40,000	--	--	-40,000
ADVANCED MATERIALS.....	--	--	--	--	--
COUNTERTERROR TECHNICAL SUPPORT.....	7,000	7,000	7,000	--	--
CONCEPT EVALUATIONS.....	100,000	--	--	-100,000	--
MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER.....	20,000	30,000	20,000	--	-10,000
STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGY.....	268,380	268,380	288,380	+20,000	+20,000
TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY.....	117,900	117,900	120,900	+3,000	+3,000
ADVANCED SUBMARINE PROPULSION.....	--	--	--	--	--
HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING.....	--	--	--	--	--
PARTICLE BEAM TECHNOLOGY.....	3,000	3,000	3,000	--	--
INTEGRATED COMMAND AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY.....	35,500	135,500	36,800	+1,300	-98,700
MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY.....	62,036	143,036	93,036	+31,000	-50,000

[In thousands of dollars]

	Senate compared with--			
	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Budget estimate House allowance
TREATY VERIFICATION.....	19,800	19,800	19,800	---
DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY.....	441,141	341,141	290,142	-150,999
FOCUS HOPE.....	---	20,000	---	---
ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIAL PROJECT.....	---	20,000	---	---
DOO ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES DEVELOPMENT.....	---	10,000	---	---
TOTAL, TECHNOLOGY BASE.....	1,252,626	1,448,626	1,078,357	-174,269
ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT				
STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE (SDI).....	4,572,574	2,656,000	4,600,000	+27,426
JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	10,260	10,260	20,000	+9,740
DOO/DOE CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY MOU.....	---	---	---	---
EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION OF MAJOR INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGI.....	289,700	224,700	277,960	-11,740
ADVANCED ASW TECHNOLOGY.....	---	---	---	---
ADVANCED STOVL TECHNOLOGY.....	---	---	---	---
LASER COMMUNICATIONS.....	---	---	---	---
FUEL CELL TECHNOLOGY.....	---	---	---	---
LIGHTSAT.....	---	---	---	---
RELOCATABLE TARGET DETECTION TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.....	10,000	28,000	10,000	-18,000
MINIATURE DIAGNOSTIC PROTON ACCELERATOR.....	---	---	---	---
ADVANCED SUBMARINE TECHNOLOGY.....	---	75,000	---	---
PRE-COMPETITIVE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	---	50,000	75,000	+75,000
CTAS.....	---	---	---	---
SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT.....	10,184	10,184	10,184	---
MICROWAVE/MILLIMETER WAVE MONOLITHIC INTEGRATED CIRCUI.....	---	---	---	---
PROTOTYPING OF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGIES AND INNOVATIVE CO.....	---	---	---	---
STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM.....	---	---	---	---
EXCIMER LASER TECHNOLOGY.....	---	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate compared with--
						Budget estimate House allowance
COMPUTER AIDED LOGISTICS SUPPORT.....	10,475	10,475	---	---	---	-10,475
MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
BALANCED TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE.....	191,568	---	154,968	---	---	+154,968
COOPERATIVE DOD/VA MEDICAL RESEARCH.....	---	---	---	---	---	-20,000
MEDICAL RESEARCH.....	---	30,000	---	---	---	-30,000
MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY.....	---	30,000	---	---	---	-4,600
TACTICAL MISSILE DEFENSE INITIATIVE - DEM VAL.....	206,200	206,200	201,600	---	---	-787,460
CONSOLIDATED DOD SOFTWARE INITIATIVE.....	508,000	787,460	---	---	---	-20,000
ROCKET MOTOR DEMILITARIZATION PROGRAM.....	6,932	26,932	6,932	---	---	-16,900
COMMAND AND CONTROL RESEARCH.....	44,000	54,000	37,100	---	---	---
INFRARED FOCAL PLANE ARRAY.....	28,000	28,000	28,000	---	---	---
FORCE ENHANCEMENTS-ACTIVE.....	2,069	2,069	2,069	---	---	---
ADVANCED SPECIAL OPERATIONS RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
ADVANCED SPECIAL OPERATIONS RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	3,000	3,000	3,000	---	---	---
SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	13,700	16,700	15,700	---	---	-1,000
SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	299	299	299	---	---	---
TOTAL, ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	5,906,961	4,239,279	5,442,812	---	---	+1,203,533
STRATEGIC PROGRAMS						
VERIFICATION TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION.....	83,230	83,230	71,980	---	---	-11,250
ISLAND SUN SUPPORT.....	60,448	60,448	60,448	---	---	---
ISLAND SUN.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
AIR DEFENSE INITIATIVE.....	273,000	123,000	164,000	---	---	+41,000
TACTICAL MISSILE DEFENSE INITIATIVE FSD.....	70,000	70,000	---	---	---	-70,000
NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT.....	11,333	11,333	11,333	---	---	---
WAMCCS SYSTEMS ENGINEER.....	11,635	11,635	11,635	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

	Senate compared with--			
	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Budget estimate House allowance
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (ME)	3,934	3,934	3,934	---
WMCCS ADP MODERNIZATION.....	40,026	40,026	40,026	---
TOTAL, STRATEGIC PROGRAMS.....	553,606	403,606	363,356	-190,250
	=====	=====	=====	=====
TACTICAL PROGRAMS				
PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT.....	39,926	60,926	39,926	-21,000
JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM.....	20,740	20,740	20,740	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAM - C3I.....	5,300	10,300	5,300	-5,000
NON-ACOUSTIC ASW.....	---	100,000	30,000	-70,000
AIM-9 CONSOLIDATED PROGRAM.....	43,781	70,139	43,781	-26,358
THEATER TACTICAL BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE.....	---	---	---	---
JOINT STANDOFF WEAPONS PROGRAM.....	20,000	---	---	---
JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	118,570	118,570	118,570	---
CINC C2 INITIATIVES.....	1,803	1,803	---	-1,803
CINC C2 INITIATIVES.....	---	---	---	---
C3 INTEROPERABILITY (JOINT TACTICAL C3 AGENCY).....	43,961	43,961	43,961	---
MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JOINT TACTICAL C3 AGENCY).....	7,103	7,103	7,103	---
JOINT REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLES PROGRAM.....	68,562	86,300	70,513	-15,787
MOBILE OFFSHORE BASE.....	---	---	---	---
NON-LETHAL FORCE.....	---	---	---	---
JOINT SIMULATION OFFICE.....	---	---	40,000	+40,000
NATIONAL GUARD INITIATIVE.....	---	---	---	---
IF SAR RADAR TECHNOLOGY.....	---	---	---	---
GENERAL SUPPORT FOR SO/LIC.....	---	---	2,000	+2,000
FORCE ENHANCEMENTS-ACTIVE.....	---	---	---	---
SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	194,290	207,250	172,676	-34,574
SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT...	10,637	15,837	10,637	-5,200

[In thousands of dollars]

	Senate compared with--			
	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Budget estimate House allowance
SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS.....	54,190	21,893	54,190	--- +32,297
SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES (TRANSFER FR. AF).....	---	1,991	---	--- -1,991
TOTAL, TACTICAL PROGRAMS.....	628,863	766,813	659,397	+30,534 -107,416
=====				
INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS				
LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS).....	10,102	10,102	10,102	--- ---
SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM.....	1,600	1,600	1,600	--- ---
SELECTED ACTIVITIES.....	---	---	---	--- ---
DMA MAPPING, CHARTING, AND GEODESY (MC&G) PRODUCTION S	226,790	226,790	226,790	--- ---
AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT PROGRAM.....	222,800	322,800	---	-222,800 -322,800
DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES.....	6,955	6,955	6,955	--- ---
DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES.....	52,876	74,876	52,876	--- -22,000
C31 INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS.....	8,600	8,600	8,600	--- ---
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO OSD COUNTERNARCOTICS.....	---	---	---	--- ---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	1,226,759	1,263,088	1,218,359	-8,400 -44,729
TOTAL, INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS.....	1,756,482	1,914,811	1,525,282	-231,200 -389,529
=====				
DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT				
MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY.....	---	50,000	157,000	+157,000 +107,000
MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PROGRAM.....	---	---	---	--- ---
FCIMS PROGRAMS.....	---	---	27,000	+27,000 +27,000
MANUFACTURING ENGINEERING EDUCATION.....	---	---	25,000	+25,000 +25,000
MANAGERS IN THE CLASSROOMS.....	---	---	5,000	+5,000 +5,000
ADVANCED MATERIALS.....	---	---	15,000	+15,000 +15,000

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Budget estimate	House allowance
ADV. MFG. INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES.....	10,751	10,751	7,401	-3,350	-3,350
INTEGRATED DIAGNOSTICS.....	40,956	--	19,256	-21,700	+19,256
NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--
JOINT SERVICE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SYSTEMS DEV.....	--	--	--	--	--
JOINT SERVICE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPME	--	--	--	--	--
TECHNICAL SUPPORT TO USD(A).....	41,176	38,176	41,176	--	+3,000
GENERAL SUPPORT FOR PA&E.....	--	--	--	--	--
GENERAL SUPPORT FOR POLICY.....	--	--	--	--	--
GENERAL SUPPORT FOR NET ASSESSMENT.....	--	--	--	--	--
GENERAL SUPPORT FOR FM&P.....	--	--	--	--	--
TECHNICAL SUPPORT TO USD(A)--CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY.....	--	--	--	--	--
RAND NATIONAL DEFENSE RESEARCH INSTITUTE.....	--	--	--	--	--
BLACK LIGHT.....	4,000	4,000	4,000	--	-15,000
GENERAL SUPPORT TO C3I.....	--	15,000	--	--	--
FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION.....	10,612	10,612	10,612	--	--
FOREIGN TECHNOLOGY MONITORING.....	--	--	--	--	--
GENERAL SUPPORT FOR P&L.....	--	--	--	--	--
CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS.....	--	--	--	--	--
ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER.....	--	--	--	--	--
SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH.....	--	--	--	--	--
SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH.....	--	--	--	--	--
CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS.....	--	--	--	--	--
DOD SUPPORT ACTIVITIES.....	14,200	14,200	14,200	--	-22,500
DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER.....	--	22,500	--	--	-5,500
INFORMATION ANALYSIS CENTERS.....	--	5,500	--	--	--
R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVAL.....	--	--	--	--	--
R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATI	--	--	--	--	--
PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS.....	600	600	600	--	--
MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)....	17,667	17,667	17,667	--	--
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO OSD COUNTERNARCOTICS.....	--	--	--	--	--
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO OSD COUNTERNARCOTICS.....	--	--	--	--	--

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom- mendation	Senate compared with--	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS.....	---	17,000	---	---	-17,000
JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MGMT OFFICE.....	---	---	---	---	---
STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM.....	---	---	---	---	---
TECHNOLOGY SECURITY FUNCTIONS.....	---	---	---	---	---
RESEARCH PROJECTS.....	---	---	---	---	---
INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES/FFRDC.....	---	---	---	---	---
LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE/FFRDC.....	---	---	---	---	---
SUPERCOMPUTERS.....	---	---	---	---	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAM.....	---	---	-25,574	-25,574	-25,574
CONTRACTOR TRAVEL.....	---	---	318,338	+178,376	+112,332
TOTAL, DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT.....	139,962	206,006	318,338	+178,376	+112,332
REMISSION TO BE DETERMINED.....	---	---	---	---	---
DBOF TECHNICAL CORRECTION: DTIC.....	---	---	4,200	+4,200	+4,200
DBOF TECHNICAL CORRECTION: IACS.....	---	---	1,800	+1,800	+1,800
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL DEF AG.....	10,238,500	8,979,141	9,393,542	-844,958	+414,401

DEVELOPMENTAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

Appropriations, 1991	\$237,720,000
Budget estimate, 1992	286,300,000
House allowance	221,300,000
Committee recommendation	215,764,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$215,764,000 for developmental test and evaluation, defense, a decrease of \$70,536,000 to the budget request. The recommendation is \$5,536,000 below the House allowance.

SUMMARY TABLE

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation versus
Central Test and Evaluation Investment Development (CTEIP)	125,527	89,927	-35,600
Foreign comparative testing	34,923	22,192	-12,731
Live fire testing	16,450	16,450	
Joint technical coordinating group for aircraft survivability			
Development test and evaluation	109,400	87,195	-22,205
Total, Director of Test and Evaluation, Defense	286,300	215,764	-70,536

The budget activities and programs funded under this appropriation are discussed below.

(In thousands of dollars)

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Total, developmental test and evaluation, defense	286,300	221,300	215,764	-70,536	-5,536

Central Test and Evaluation Investment Program [CTEIP].—The Central Test and Evaluation Investment Program [CTEIP] develops test instrumentation and equipment for use in improving multiservice test capability. The Committee approves a total of \$89,927,000, a decrease of \$35,600,000 to the budget request and an amount which is \$4,400,000 above the House allowance. The recommendation decreases the budget request as follows:

One, deletes \$14,000,000 sought for fiscal year 1992 to develop the common airborne instrumentation system [CAIS]. The CAIS will provide a common, modular instrumentation system which collects and relays data during flight tests. The CAIS effort was delayed in fiscal year 1991 allowing the fiscal year 1991 funds to be used for CAIS development in fiscal year 1992. A critical foundation for the project is use of CAIS by the ATF, LH, and AX programs. Currently, there is uncertainty because there are no service or program commitments to use the CAIS.

The Committee directs that the fiscal year 1993 budget request be supported by memoranda of agreement with each of the services and the test agencies requiring all major acquisition programs to use the CAIS without waiver. A general provision is recommended

to prohibit the use of fiscal year 1992 funds by any development programs to develop or commit to use other instrumentation systems. The purpose of this language is to allow a fiscal year 1993 decision to continue CAIS development or to allow alternative instrumentation system development.

Two, deletes \$9,600,000 of fiscal year 1992 RDT&E funding requested to build an aerial cable facility to be used for constrained testing of missiles and guidance equipment and drop testing of systems and components. OSD acknowledges this project should be funded as military construction, and these funds have been deleted.

Three, deletes \$9,000,000 budgeted for the development of a global range capability. The global range capability project would develop scheduling and control systems, test range equipment and safety procedures to allow testing spacecraft and long-range weapon systems. Development of this test resource is premature based on the uncertain timetable for the development and testing of systems requiring this capability.

Four, deletes \$3,000,000 of the requested \$6,000,000 for the Test Technology Development Program. The budget request included 100 percent growth in this program to evaluate new technologies which can be quickly fielded to improve test and evaluation capabilities. DOD did not clearly identify the efforts to be funded with the fiscal year 1992 funds, so the Committee recommends holding funding to the fiscal year 1991 level.

The Committee also directs that \$14,500,000 of the funds provided in this program element are available only for continued development of Global Positioning System Range Applications Joint Program Office projects.

Foreign comparative test.—The Committee recommends a reduction of \$12,731,000 to the budget request of \$34,923,000. The House allowance fully funds this program element. The recommendation deletes the following requested funds: (1) \$6,100,000 to test a digital flight control system potentially suitable as an F-14 upgrade since the entire status of future enhancements is uncertain; (2) \$251,000 to test foreign field rations due to concern about the domestic meals-ready-to eat industrial base; and (3) \$6,380,000 identified as excess to firm program requirements or available as a result of poor execution of fiscal year 1991 funds.

Development test and evaluation.—The Committee provides \$87,195,000 of the budget request, eliminating \$22,205,000 not expected to be spent in fiscal year 1992 due to slow obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 1991 funds. The House recommendation is \$2,795,000 below the Senate funding level.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

Appropriations, 1991	\$15,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	14,200,000
House allowance	14,200,000
Committee recommendation	14,200,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$14,200,000 for operational test and evaluation, defense programs, providing the requested funding as does the House allowance. These activities are

conducted by the independent Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense.

The budget activities and programs funded under this appropriation are presented below.

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Recommendation compared to—	
				Budget request	House allowance
Operational test and evaluation, defense	14,200	14,200	14,200		

TITLE V

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND

Appropriations, 1991	
Budget estimate, 1992	\$3,400,200,000
House allowance	2,444,100,000
Committee recommendation	3,400,200,000

The Committee recommends appropriations totaling \$3,400,200,000 in title V, revolving and management funds, for fiscal year 1992. This is the same as the budget request and \$956,100,000 above the House allowance.

The Department requested appropriations in this title for the defense business operations fund [DBOF]. This fund is used to manage defense support activities which are similar to commercial activities, such as the supply system and depot maintenance.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND

The Department of Defense proposes establishing the defense business operations fund in fiscal year 1992. This proposal coincides with the Department's broader effort to reduce costs and improve the efficiency of its support operations through the defense management review process.

The DBOF proposal has been met with both antipathy and confusion. The antipathy arises, for the most part, from the perception of Congress losing influence on and oversight of programs to be subsumed in the fund. The confusion arises from several factors; probably the most important of these was the Department having not clearly defined the advantages of establishing DBOF when the proposal was first made to Congress.

The DBOF would be implemented in at least two phases. The first phase, which is to occur in fiscal year 1992, is comprised of establishing the DBOF as a single revolving fund into which all of the existing stock and industrial revolving funds would be subsumed. Stock and industrial funds include activities such as depot maintenance, supply operations, and transportation. Other smaller programs previously funded separately in the O&M accounts also would be included, such as DOD's commissary operations and its finance and accounting programs.

In 1992, DOD also proposes to modify the pricing and accounting methods currently used by the revolving funds. The most significant change here is the reintroduction of capital budgeting principles. To implement these principles, the Department proposes to purchase capital equipment and construct facilities through the

DBOF for activities operating within the fund. The costs of these items would be covered by revenues from sales of goods and services to the fund's customers.

In the second and following phases, which are to occur in fiscal year 1993 and beyond, DOD intends to include in the fund many of the operations programs which support our combat forces. These are, for example, contract auditing and management activities, individual training programs, and medical activities.

With each successive step in the congressional budget review process, the DBOF proposal has achieved increasing acceptance. Yet, the Committee still harbors concerns over what effects this proposal will have on the Department's operations. The most important of these are:

Congressional oversight.—The Committee is troubled by the prospect of losing oversight by consolidating too many programs into one revolving fund. For example, the Department will no longer have to notify Congress of the transfer of funds between the separate appropriations to be consolidated in the DBOF, as it must do today.

Capital budgeting.—This aspect of the DBOF proposal raises particular fears in Congress. This practice has been tried before and has been soundly criticized. Formerly known as the Asset Capitalization Program [ACP], it was disbanded by Congress in 1990 in light of several GAO studies which indicated that the program had been mismanaged.

Confusion within DOD.—Confusion over the DBOF proposal is not limited to outsiders alone. Even among the military services there is a degree of uncertainty over what's to be done.

There is undoubtedly some risk associated with approving DBOF; there is also the potential that this program will significantly improve the Department's support of the military forces. In the belief that the potential gains from DBOF outweigh the assumed risks, the recommendation approves the establishment of and funding request for DBOF in 1992. The Committee's recommendation includes minor changes to the Senate-approved authorization bill's version of DBOF (that bill established and fully funded DBOF in 1992) which will serve to minimize any risk Congress may be assuming. These are as follows:

Reporting requirements.—The Secretary of Defense is directed to submit to the relevant congressional oversight committees:

- A quarterly report detailing the financial status and operations of the DBOF to date. This report should include information on: the current cash balance of the fund; capital purchase obligations and expenditures; and significant personnel actions being undertaken by the activities in the fund, such as reductions-in-force notices. The first of these reports is to be submitted no later than April 1, 1992.
- Within 60 days immediately following the close of the fiscal year, the Department also must submit to Congress a financial summary detailing the operations of the fund throughout the year. This report should resemble financial statements prepared annually by American businesses for their corporate stockholders and would be audited under the provisions of the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990.

Capital budgeting.—The recommendation approves the introduction of capital budgeting in the DBOF for equipment and minor infrastructure improvements but not for military construction. Funding adjustments have been made in the appropriate O&M, Procurement, and RDT&E appropriations accounts to reflect this direction. In addition, the Committee recommends the creation of a subaccount within the DBOF appropriation account for the purpose of retaining and disbursing funds for capital purchases. A general provision has been added which outlines restrictions on the use of funds accruing to this subaccount. These restrictions will facilitate better agency management of the program and congressional oversight.

The Committee believes that the Department's plan for implementing DBOF in fiscal year 1992, as amended by the Committee's recommendations, is an appropriate first step. The Committee will not approve any proposal which seeks to add other programs to the fund until the Department can demonstrate that the first phase of this proposal has succeeded in realizing the management and efficiency benefits it claims will occur. The Department is surely aware of the Committee's concerns about the program. This, coupled with the fiscal imperatives it must face in the future, gives the Department every incentive to make it work.

OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

Pentagon reservation maintenance revolving fund.—The 1991 National Defense Authorization Act transferred the control of the Pentagon reservation from the General Services Administration to the Defense Department. The act also established the Pentagon reservation maintenance revolving fund with the intention that this fund be used to finance maintenance, construction, and other activities associated with the upkeep of the Pentagon reservation facilities. The Secretary of Defense was authorized to establish rates and collect charges from using agencies to finance these activities.

The Department plans to initiate construction of a new heating and refrigeration plant and classified waste incinerator for the Pentagon reservation in 1992. The Committee supports these projects and directs that profits accruing to the Pentagon reservation maintenance fund (the Department estimates profits to be \$26,800,000 by the end of fiscal year 1991) be used to finance them. The Committee provides no additional appropriations since it believes that these and future projects are best financed through charges to its customers established and reflected in the budget submission to Congress, as was intended in the 1991 act.

DOD commissary agency purchasing activities.—The Committee supports the Department's initiative to merge the military commissaries, to realize economies and improve service to DOD personnel and their dependents. Last year, DOD merged the service commands in Alaska into the Pacific Command, creating a new, subunified command. In both Anchorage and Fairbanks, Army and Air Force bases are located in close proximity, and personnel for installations in both areas utilize facilities on each base. The Committee believes that the Commissary Agency could realize significant sav-

ings by creating a single purchasing organization in Alaska to serve the several Air Force and Army bases in the State. Currently, purchasing for the installations in Alaska is shared by different offices located elsewhere in the United States. The Director of the Commissary Agency shall report to the Committee the plan for the consolidation of purchasing services in Alaska not later than February 15, 1992. The Committee expects the commissary purchasing office in Alaska to be operational not later than June 1, 1992.

TITLE VI

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE

Appropriations, 1991	\$292,700,000
Budget estimate, 1992	474,800,000
House allowance	451,800,000
Committee recommendation	474,800,000

The Chemical Demilitarization Program is based on section 1412 of the 1986 Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 99-145) that directs the Department of Defense to destroy the complete unitary chemical stockpile by 1994 in conjunction with the production of binary chemical weapons. The fiscal year 1989 Defense Authorization Act extended program completion to 1997.

The Chemical Demilitarization Program provides resources to develop and test monitoring and disposal technology; equip, operate, and maintain disposal facilities; provide transportation of chemical agents and munitions for disposal; disposal of all chemical agent destruction waste products; and the decontamination and dismantle of all disposal equipment at the conclusion of toxic operations.

The following table details the Committee recommendation in comparison to the President's amended budget request and the House passed bill:

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate compared to—	
				Budget estimate	House allowance
Operation and maintenance	\$213,098	\$208,698	\$210,900	—\$2,198	+\$2,202
Procurement	261,702	229,202	230,000	—31,702	+ 798
Procurement (AP CY)			20,000	+ 20,000	+ 20,000
Research and development		13,900	13,900	+ 13,900	
Retrograde					
Total, chemical agents and munitions destruction, defense	474,800	451,800	474,800		+ 23,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

BUDGET ACTIVITY 1—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Cryofracture.—The Department of the Army failed to request funding for the continued research and development of the cryofracture technique for the destruction of chemical munitions. The Committee provides \$13,900,000 in research and development funding in fiscal year 1992 for this activity, the same as the House allowance.

With continuing delays in operational verification testing [OVT] at the baseline facility on Johnston Atoll, the Committee questions the Army's reluctance to proceed with the development and construction of the alternative cryofracture destruction system. The Committee continues to believe that there are many questions on the cost and efficiency of the baseline system and further believes that funding the development and construction of an alternative approach is a sound investment.

The Committee strongly supports the cryofracture development program and expects the Army to budget for the construction of a facility in fiscal year 1992.

BUDGET ACTIVITY 2—PROCUREMENT

Procurement.—The amended budget request contains \$261,702,000 for the procurement of all process and support equipment used in the disposal facilities for destroying the unitary chemical stockpile. The Committee recommends \$230,000,000 in procurement and \$20,000,000 in advance procurement for these activities in fiscal year 1992.

Because of the delays in the JACADS operational verification testing, the Committee believes that follow-on funding for equipment procurement for Anniston and Umatilla Army Depots' chemical destruction facilities should also be delayed. The Committee, therefore recommends a reduction of \$31,702,000 from the amounts requested for equipment procurement for these two facilities.

The Committee further recommends that \$20,000,000 be provided for advance procurement equipment funding for the cryofracture facility which the Committee believes should begin construction in fiscal year 1993.

BUDGET ACTIVITY 3—OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

Operation and maintenance.—The Army's amended budget request contains \$213,098,000 in operations and maintenance funding for the management and technical and operational support required for the demilitarization of the unitary chemical agent and munitions stockpile and the Emergency Preparedness Program. Because of delays in the program, the Committee provides \$210,900,000 for these activities in fiscal year 1992, \$2,198,000 below the budget request but \$2,202,000 higher than the amounts provided by the House.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTERDRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

Appropriations, 1991	\$1,084,100,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,158,600,000
House allowance	1,155,994,000
Committee recommendation	1,117,075,000

The Committee recommends appropriations totaling \$1,117,075,000 in title VI, Counternarcotics and Drug Interdiction Program for fiscal year 1992. This is \$41,525,000 below the budget estimate and \$38,919,000 below the House allowance.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendations, by appropriation, are compared with the budget estimate and the House allowance in the following table:

DRUG INTERDICTION FUNDING

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee compared with House allowance
Fiscal year 1992 budget request	1,158,600	1,158,600	
Guard and Reserve personnel			
Operation and maintenance	- 35,306	- 31,525	+ 3,781
Procurement	+ 14,700	- 10,000	- 24,700
Research and development	+ 18,000		- 18,000
Total	+ 1,155,994	+ 1,117,075	- 38,919

COUNTERNARCOTICS DRUG INTERDICTION OVERVIEW

Appropriations under this title finance the participation of the Department of Defense in the war on drugs. These funds are used to purchase fuel and spare parts for training activities, pay civilian personnel, purchase supplies and equipment, finance drug rehabilitation programs, and training exercises.

Justification materials.—The Committee is pleased that the Department made an effort to improve their justification materials. However, the Committee notes that there are still many weaknesses in these materials. The Committee directs that the Department prepare a detailed breakout of the RDT&E portion of the budget. Projects should be broken down to the task level, detailing the funding, schedule, and milestone of each task. Additionally, in the operation and maintenance accounts, justification materials should include a personnel resource summary, schedule of increases and decreases and an OP-32 for each project.

Support to other Federal agencies and law enforcement agencies.—The Committee is pleased with the positive response of the law enforcement agencies to the efforts of the Department. The Committee agrees that this program is valuable and should continue. However, the Committee notes that the entire mission of the Department of Defense is to support law enforcement agencies. Therefore, the Committee recommends earmarking \$20,000,000 for support to law enforcement agencies, which is a decrease from the

previous year's funding. Of these moneys, the Committee directs that the Department fund: \$4,771,000 for digital telephones for the FBI; \$1,533,000 for wordprocessing equipment and dialed number recorders for the DEA; \$200,000 for cellular telephones for the U.S. Marshal Service.

New program starts.—The Committee notes that there are a number of new programs which the Department has proposed in their budget request. Many of these programs are premature, or duplicative of other programs currently in operation. Therefore the Committee recommends the following reductions:

New programs

Staff operations—(2411).....	—\$1,000,000
Counterdrug cell—(2416).....	—700,000
SouthCom Pysops—(2403).....	—400,000
C ³ upgrade—(2357).....	—16,192,000
PHM link-11—(3110).....	—200,000
USARSO aviation—(2444).....	—4,208,000
USARPAC Reg. Spt.—(2328).....	—625,000

Program consolidations.—The Department's budget request includes \$37,100,000 and \$3,600,000 for the operations and maintenance of DOD aerostats and E-2C's. The Committee is aware that the Coast Guard also operates aerostats and E-2C's for the purpose of drug interdiction. It is more cost-effective for these systems to be operated by one agency. Therefore, the Committee has added \$45,100,000 for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard aerostats and \$13,200,000 for the E-2C's.

Unjustified growth.—The Department of Defense submitted a budget request which proposed unjustified program increases of 33 percent and 19 percent for OPTEMPO and demand reduction respectively. Additionally, DOD has requested growths of 109 percent in civilian personnel and 62 percent in travel. The Committee has always been a strong supporter of the counternarcotics/drug interdiction role of DOD. However, the Committee will not allow this program to grow uninhibited and act as a funding source for DOD programs which could not be financed within the nondrug related Defense budget. Therefore, the Committee recommends reductions of \$35,000,000 and \$10,000,000 to OPTEMPO and demand reduction respectively. Additionally, the Committee directs that none of these reductions be applied against the National Guard and Reserve program.

DRUG INTERDICTION O&M FUNDING

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee compared with House allowance
Fiscal year 1992 budget request	808,749	808,749	
Army	—61,656	—29,625	+32,031
Navy		+13,000	+13,000
Marine Corp	—4,900		+4,900
Air Force	+23,250	+45,100	+21,850
Defense agencies	+8,000	—15,000	—23,000
Army Reserve			
Navy Reserve			
Marine Corp Reserve			

DRUG INTERDICTION O&M FUNDING—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee compared with House allowance
Air Force Reserve.....			
Army Guard.....			
Air National Guard.....			
OPTEMPO.....		- 35,000	- 35,000
Demand reduction.....		- 10,000	- 10,000
Total.....	773,443	777,224	+ 3,781

Utilization of T-47 aircraft.—The recent termination of a Navy lease has made 15 T-47 aircraft available for other missions. The Committee understands that the T-47 could provide significant benefits to the National Guard counternarcotics mission, in coordination with the U.S. Customs Service and Border Patrol. The Committee expects the National Guard and the Customs Service to evaluate the potential use of the T-47, mission-related system modifications, and deployment to Southwest border National Guard units. If the National Guard and the Customs Service reach agreement on the utilization of the T-47 for this mission, such funds as may be necessary shall be available from this account for the employment of the T-47 in the counternarcotics mission.

Fort Huachuca aerostat access road.—The Committee is aware of the poor condition of the access road leading to the Fort Huachuca aerostat. Aerostat personnel have experienced damage to vehicles and during severe weather, the road is sometimes impassable. Because of the concerns for safety and security at the site, the Committee instructs the Air Force to conduct a study on improving access to the Fort Huachuca aerostat site. Among the options that the Air Force should consider are the paving of the entire secondary access from the main gate; improving a quarter mile turn-off road from Garden Canyon Road; and the opening of an additional access point from the Buffalo Soldier Road to Fort Huachuca. During this study, the Air Force should identify the type of funding necessary for the road improvements, and solicit comments of Sierra Vista, AZ, and the residents of Shadow Ridge development. The Air Force should submit the results of this study, including cost estimates to implement, to the Committee no later than March 1, 1992.

Human rights abuses in Peru.—The Committee is concerned about the human rights abuses taking place in Peru. Currently, the Congress has put on hold a \$35,000,000 military aid package to Peru while it reviews the situation. The Department has requested funds in order to send United States troops down to Peru for training. Though the training benefit is to be accrued mainly to U.S. troops, any expenditure of money in and to this country prior to the completion of the congressional review would be premature. Therefore, the Committee prohibits DOD from expending any moneys in support of deployments for training or any other expenditures in and for Peru until the Congress has resolved the human rights question.

National Guard demand reduction program.—The Committee fully supports the Department's request of \$5,400,000 for the National Guard demand reduction program. The National Guard, in conjunction with Federal, State, and local authorities, currently provides significant assistance in the eradication and interdiction of illegal drugs. An aggressive demand reduction program by the National Guard accrues enormous civilian and military benefits to the States. Because of the garrison nature of the National Guard, the Committee recommends that the Department align a larger portion of its program to support central direction and management of the State plans in order to ensure an effective and consistent program.

Civil Air Patrol.—The Committee fully supports the Department's request of \$1,000,000 for the Civil Air Patrol's participation in the drug interdiction mission. To ensure the efficacy of this program, the Committee directs that reimbursement shall not be required from Federal, State, and local agencies that utilize CAP for drug interdiction and surveillance.

DRUG INTERDICTION PROCUREMENT FUNDING

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee compared with House allowance
Fiscal year 1992 budget request	138,811	138,811	
Army	- 12,300	- 10,000	+ 2,300
Navy			
Marine Corp	- 3,000		+ 3,000
Air Force			
Defense agencies	15,000		- 15,000
Army Reserve			
Navy Reserve	15,000		- 15,000
Marine Corp Reserve			
Air Force Reserve			
Air National Guard			
Total	153,511	128,811	- 24,700

Aerostats.—The Committee is concerned about a recent action by the Defense Department withdrawing \$47,500,000 of prior year funding set aside on an aerostat contract. The Committee continues to strongly support the aerostat program and is, therefore, earmarking \$47,500,000 in the fiscal year 1992 "Procurement" account in order to replace those funds that were withdrawn. This action is being taken to ensure the implementation of the aerostat drug surveillance network along the Southern U.S. border and the Caribbean.

The Committee believes that the completion of a radar surveillance network in the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean region is essential to our national drug interdiction efforts. The Committee understands that the aerostat system has long been considered the most cost effective and economical means of preventing illegal drugs from entering the United States and expects the Department of Defense to complete installation of this network as soon as possible.

Customs P-3 ASARS.—The Committee has included \$10,000,000 for modification of an advanced synthetic aperture radar system [ASARS-1] on a P-3 aircraft operated by the U.S. Customs Service in a tactical air interdiction role supporting the Department of Defense in its detection and monitoring efforts against drug traffickers. The recommended funds will provide the Customs Service with a complete SAR capability including associated ground processor and exploitation equipment.

The ASARS-1 system was upgraded by the Air Force at a cost exceeding \$300,000,000 and was fielded to operating location just prior to termination of the SR-71 program. The ASARS-1 system is now excess to Air Force requirements and is available as government furnished equipment [GFE] to other government activities. The system is currently undergoing modification to slow its performance characteristics to accommodate a subsonic operational environment. The U.S. Customs Service P-3 will be the initial subsonic aircraft to incorporate the modified SAR system.

DRUG INTERDICTION RDT&E FUNDING

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Committee compared with House allowance
Fiscal year 1992 budget request	76,899	76,899	
Army	- 5,000		+ 5,000
Navy			
Marine Corp			
Air Force			
Defense agencies	+ 23,000		- 23,000
Total	94,899	76,899	- 18,000

INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 1991	\$99,480,000
Budget estimate, 1992	116,200,000
House allowance	121,900,000
Committee recommendation	116,200,000

The Committee recommends appropriations totaling \$116,200,000 in title VI, the same as the budget request. This is \$5,700,000 below the House allowance.

TITLE VII

RELATED AGENCIES

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND

Appropriations, 1991	\$164,600,000
New obligation authority, 1992:	
Estimate	164,100,000
Recommended	164,100,000
Change	

The Committee recommends \$164,100,000, the budget request, for the Central Intelligence Agency [CIA] retirement and disability system fund. The CIA Retirement Act of 1964 for Certain Employees (Public Law 88-643) authorized the establishment of a CIA retirement and disability system for a limited number of CIA employees, and authorized the establishment and maintenance of a fund from which benefits would be paid to qualified beneficiaries. The fiscal year 1992 request is \$500,000 below the fiscal year 1991 appropriation of \$164,600,000.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY STAFF

Appropriations, 1991	\$28,900,000
New obligation authority, 1992:	
Estimate	30,719,000
Recommended	28,819,000
Change	-1,900,000

The Intelligence Community Staff [ICS] provides the Director of Central Intelligence [DCI] with staff assistance to carry out his intelligence community responsibilities. Specifically, the staff supports the DCI in the execution of his responsibilities to develop, review, and approve the budget for the National Foreign Intelligence Program, to evaluate the performance of foreign intelligence activities, and to develop issues, goals, and other required guidance for the intelligence community.

The fiscal year 1992 budget request of the ICS totals \$30,719,000. For fiscal year 1992, the Committee recommends an appropriation of \$28,819,000, \$1,900,000 less than the request. The Committee adjustment is further discussed in the classified report.

NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION ACT

The Committee appropriates \$180,000,000 to fund the National Security Education Act initiated by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence in title VIII of S. 1539, the Senate intelligence authorization bill, subject to its confirmation by the conference committee between the two Houses. The Committee strongly supports the program's emphasis on interdisciplinary critical area and lan-

guage studies, that may be funded by this legislation. Second, to the extent that the program funds graduate fellowships, there should be a substantial payback to the Federal Government for such education in the way of obligated time of service, and such graduate fellowship program should include some mandatory foreign language training. In lieu of such payback for such graduate fellowships, service in the field of education in such studies shall be also considered.

Of the \$180,000,000, \$145,000,000 shall be placed in a trust fund to be managed by the Secretary of Defense, and which shall be invested exclusively in Treasury bills for the sole purpose of this program in future years. The remaining \$35,000,000 shall be used for purposes authorized for the program, but any of the \$35,000,000 remaining at the end of the fiscal year shall be placed in the trust fund for future program use. The program shall be managed by the Secretary of Defense with the advice and recommendations of a board to be established, under his direction, which shall include, at a minimum, the Director of Central Intelligence, as well as the Secretary of Commerce.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill "which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

At the point when the Committee reports this measure, the conference on the Fiscal Year 1992 Defense Authorization Act is nearing completion. As a consequence, the Committee has acted in good faith in its attempt to comply fully with requirements stipulated under paragraph 7, rule XVI.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 12, RULE XXVI OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 12 of rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any statute include "(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee."

With respect to this bill, in accordance with the rules of the Senate, it is the opinion of the Committee that it is necessary to dispense with these requirements in order to expedite the business of the Senate.

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

This recommendation deletes the following House provisions: Sections 8015, 8016, 8018, 8019, 8027, 8040, 8046, 8048, 8049, 8064, 8065, 8067, 8070, 8072, 8076, 8077, 8078, 8081, 8083, 8086, 8088, 8090, 8092, 8093, 8094, 8096, 8097, 8100, 8101, 8103, 8104, 8105, 8107, 8108, 8109, 8110, 8111, 8112, 8113, 8115, 8116, 8117, 8118, 8121, 8122, 8123, and 8124.

The following general provisions are recommended:

SEC. 8001. *Publicity/propaganda limitation*.—Restricts funding for publicity or propaganda to those purposes approved by Congress.

SEC. 8002. *Compensation/employment of foreign nationals*.—Allows the Department of Defense to employ foreign nationals but limits pay raises for foreign nationals funded in this act to that approved by the U.S. Government for U.S. employees or by the host nation for employees of the host nation government, whichever is higher. An exception is made for foreign national employees of the Department of Defense in the Republic of the Philippines and foreign national employees of the Department of Defense in the Republic of Turkey. Pay raise restrictions do not apply to employees serving in U.S. diplomatic missions.

SEC. 8003. *Obligation rate of appropriations*.—Limits obligation of appropriations to the current fiscal year unless expressly provided.

SEC. 8004. *Obligations in last 2 months of fiscal year*.—Prohibits obligation of more than 20 percent of appropriations in the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

SEC. 8005. *Limitation on purchases*.—Provides that the Department of Defense must purchase American-made products listed in the provision, except for purchases less than \$25,000 and for purchases necessary to comply with agreements with foreign governments.

The Committee notes that it has long been the intent of the Congress that this provision covers not only fabrics and apparel themselves but also all stages of textile production and all types of textile products, including manufactured articles. The Committee further notes that synthetic fabric fuel containers for military aircraft are included within the coverage of this provision and directs the Secretary to instruct the relevant offices within the Department of Defense to take note of this and ensure that Department procurements are consistent with the requirements of this provision.

SEC. 8006. *Transfer authority*.—Allows the Department of Defense to transfer funds between appropriations and sets a limit of \$1,000,000,000 on funds that may be transferred.

SEC. 8007. *Working capital funds disbursements*.—Amends House provision to allow the Department to transfer funds from the re-

volving funds account to the O&M appropriations. Will also permit transfers of any excess cash accruing in 1992 from productivity savings in the defense business operations fund. Report language will direct the Department to use productivity savings generated during 1992 for retiring depot maintenance backlogs.

SEC. 8008. *Heating plants in Europe.*—Prohibits the Department of Defense from purchasing coal or coke from foreign nations for use at DOD installations in Europe when U.S. coal is available and prohibits conversions of heating plants at U.S. bases in Europe from coal to oil or natural gas, except as provided in 10 U.S.C. 2690. The provision also addresses the conversion of heating plants in the Kaiserslautern military community [KMC] in Germany.

SEC. 8009. *Special access program notification.*—Prohibits initiation of a special access program without 30 legislative days prior notification to the House and Senate Appropriations and Armed Services Committees. Amendment adds the word "legislative."

SEC. 8010. *Reprogramming instructions.*—Limits request for reprogramming to items of higher priority, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and denies requests for reprogramming where item has previously been denied by Congress.

SEC. 8011. *CHAMPUS pricing reform.*—Provides the Secretary of Defense authority to adjust payments under CHAMPUS to physicians and other health care providers. If the adjustment is downward, it may not be more than a 15-percent reduction.

SEC. 8012. *CIA availability of funds.*—Restricts the availability of funds for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency funded in the fiscal year 1992 Defense Appropriations Act to the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for the reserve for contingencies.

SEC. 8013. *Multiyear procurement.*—Provides the Department of Defense multiyear procurement contracting authority for a specific list of programs.

SEC. 8014. *CIA/special activities reprogramming.*—Prohibits transfer of funds between the Central Intelligence Agency and the Department of Defense for any activity different from that previously justified to Congress, unless the Director of Central Intelligence or the Secretary of Defense has notified the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

SEC. 8015. *Base closures.*—Requires the Department of Defense to treat governments of native American tribes as local and State governments for purposes of disposing of real property under the provisions of the Base Closures and Realignment Act.

SEC. 8016. *Civilian personnel ceilings.*—Establishes a ceiling of 1,011,348 civilian work-years in the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8017. *Lobbying.*—Denies the use of funding to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress.

SEC. 8018. *Energy alliance fuel reserve.*—The Committee recommends a new section to replace section 8110 of the fiscal year 1991 Department of Defense Appropriations Act (Public Law 101-511) establishing a petroleum, oil, lubricant [POL] stockpile in Israel equal to 4,500,000 barrels. The amendment makes funds available to the Department of Defense in fiscal years 1992-93 to purchase

petroleum products in Israel to meet emergency and other military needs of the United States and Israel as agreed to in a memorandum of agreement [MOA] between the two countries. The Committee strongly encourages the Department of Defense and Israel to conclude the terms and conditions of this MOA as quickly as possible.

The Committee also recommends that in the event of a wartime emergency, or a state of heightened military readiness on the part of either nation, all or part of the stock purchased under this provision may be withdrawn and used by the forces of either nation provided that both nations concur and notice is provided to Congress.

The Committee believes that Israel is able to provide a secure, ready and well-maintained source of POL for deployed United States forces and should be developed as a secure logistical hub for United States forces operating in the Middle East and Europe.

The Committee's interest in this program is heightened by recent reports that the Government of Libya is in the process of acquiring oil refining facilities and downstream marketing outlets in Greece, Italy, and Spain. At least one of these oil refineries, in Greece, is a major source of supply for the United States military. The Committee believes that Libyan control of these vital POL sources could seriously impair the readiness of United States forces in the Mediterranean and adversely affect their ability to acquire adequate POL supplies in an emergency.

The Committee is aware that Presidential Executive Order 12543 of January 7, 1986, and Presidential Executive Order 12538 of November 15, 1985, prohibit the trade in Libyan products, including oil, by persons or entities subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. The establishment of a secure and reliable oil stockpile in Israel would help to ensure the operational readiness of United States forces deployed to the region is maintained.

SEC. 8019. *Army central hospital fund.*—Terminates the Army central hospital fund (a nonappropriated fund instrumentality) and transfers funds to an appropriated trust fund. Funds to be used for operation and maintenance costs of donated facilities located near Army hospitals where families may stay while family members are hospitalized.

SEC. 8020. *Floating storage of petroleum.*—Requires the Department of Defense to use U.S. vessels for floating storage of petroleum.

SEC. 8021. *Humanitarian and civic assistance.*—Allows the Department of Defense to provide civic and humanitarian assistance. Amended to remove cap on number of Pacific Island patients which may be treated at Tripler Army Medical Center.

SEC. 8022. *Retention to age 60 of Guard/Reserve technicians.*—Allows the Army and Air Force to retain National Guard and Reserve technicians until the age of 60.

SEC. 8023. *Health demonstration projects.*—Provides the Department with authority to conduct health demonstration projects.

SEC. 8024. *Educational benefits and bonuses.*—Allows the Department to make contributions for educational benefits for military members in the combat arms, members who have enlisted for at least 3 years, and allows continuation of a test program to allow

benefits for noncombat arms members in a limited number of specialties.

SEC. 8025. *Tuition assistance for the Ready Reserve.*—Allows DOD to pay not more than 75 percent of charges of postsecondary education for officers in the Ready Reserve of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve.

SEC. 8026. *Organizational analyses/contracting out.*—Directs that no contracting out decision affecting more than 10 DOD civilian employees can be made without analysis of the most efficient organization for the activity.

SEC. 8027. *Depleted uranium.*—Section 8095 of last year's bill, requiring the President to acquire, over a period of 10 years, not less than 36 million pounds of depleted uranium is repealed. Since the enactment of this provision, the Committee has been provided with the results of an Institute of Defense Analyses study which states that there is no military or industry requirement to make additions of depleted uranium in the national defense stockpile.

SEC. 8028. *Automated information systems/composite health care system.*—Prohibits acquisition of major automated information systems which have not completed oversight reviews required by DOD regulations. Also sets a limit of \$1,600,000,000 as total life cycle cost for the composite health care system [CHCS].

SEC. 8029. *CIA reserve for contingencies.*—Prohibits payment of salaries to anyone who authorizes transfer of unobligated and deobligated appropriations into CIA's reserve for contingencies.

SEC. 8030. *CIA small construction projects.*—Allows funds appropriated in the Defense Appropriations Act for CIA construction projects, which are transferred to another agency for execution, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 8031. *Auxiliary minesweepers.*—Allows DOD to charter ships to be used as auxiliary minesweepers.

SEC. 8032. *CHAMPUS reform initiative limitation.*—Limits costs of CHAMPUS reform initiative to 1987 costs in California and Hawaii, but allows adjustments for price and program growth. Amends House provision to delete extension of CRI contract.

SEC. 8033. *Supercomputers.*—Allows funding for facilities at the U.S. Army Engineer's Waterways Experiment station, including availability of the supercomputer capability. Forbids purchase of foreign-manufactured supercomputers unless the Secretary of Defense certifies capability is needed for national security purposes.

SEC. 8034. *Restrictions on modifications.*—Restricts the funding of modifications for equipment which is planned to be retired or otherwise disposed of within 5 years of the completion of the modification, except for safety modifications.

SEC. 8035. *Program, project, activity definition.*—Defines programs, projects, and activities for sequestration calculation under Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act. Recommended amendment requires DOD to submit an O-1 justification book detailing funding proposals in the operation and maintenance accounts.

SEC. 8036. *Reserve components automation system.*—Fences \$172,072,000 for use only for the development, implementation, and fielding of RCAS. This provision also allows the chief of the National Guard Bureau to incorporate the use of other governmental assets in the creation of RCAS.

SEC. 8037. *Fixed-price development contracts*.—Agrees with House language, which repeats a provision in the fiscal year 1991 act regarding certain certification and advance reporting requirements about fixed price development contracts.

SEC. 8038. *Motor vehicles for intelligence activities*.—Prohibits placing monetary limitations on purchase of certain vehicles for intelligence activities.

SEC. 8039. *Classified military projects in the United States*.—Allows use of not more than \$20,000,000 appropriated to the Army during current fiscal year to fund construction of classified military projects in the United States.

SEC. 8040. *Pitch carbon fiber*.—Pitch carbon fibers, made from petroleum products, have unique physical and thermal properties which have many applications in Department of Defense weapon systems. The Committee, concerned that critical Department of Defense applications requiring pitch-based carbon fibers could become dependent upon off-shore sources, has recommended a general provision requiring 75 percent pitch carbon fiber domestic sourcing by 1994.

SEC. 8041. *Military technician/medical personnel reprogramming*.—Excludes civilian technicians and civilian medical personnel from sequestration.

SEC. 8042. *Interport differential*.—Disallows use of interport differential charges as an evaluation factor for award of Navy ship overhaul contracts on the west coast.

SEC. 8043. *CHAMPUS mental health benefits*.—Limits inpatient mental care to 30 days per year and inpatient care in a residential treatment center to 90 days per year. Prohibits admission of a patient by a mental health care provider to a facility in which the provider has an economic interest. Also provides for preauthorization for inpatient mental care, except in emergencies. Provisions may be waived in cases of medical or psychological necessity.

SEC. 8044. *Joint avionics*.—Agrees with new House language amending an existing general provision requiring three new aircraft programs to use common avionics modules by 1998. The modifications substitute AX for the terminated A-12 program and add requirements for using the Ada advanced computer language and identifying major software costs for all new DOD procurement programs.

SEC. 8045. *INF treaty reimbursable expenses*.—Relates to expenses incurred by the U.S. Government on behalf of the Soviet Union in monitoring implementation of the INF Treaty. Also allows military personnel accompanying the Soviets to be paid subsistence when they are in the area of their permanent duty station.

SEC. 8046. *ADP development and modernization*.—Reduces automated data processing development and modernization growth by \$202,000,000. This reduction, specified at the Service level, will be distributed further by the respective Service Secretaries, and the Secretary of Defense shall notify Congress of these allocations by March 1, 1992.

SEC. 8047. *Travel for families of POW/MIA*.—Allows DOD to provide transportation to families of POW's and MIA's to an annual meeting in the United States.

SEC. 8048. *Overseas civilian work-years.*—Limits the number of civilian work-years that DOD may fund overseas.

SEC. 8049. *Corporate information management initiative.*—Appropriates and provides transfer authority for \$716,729,000 which has been consolidated under the Corporate Information Management [CIM] issue.

SEC. 8050. *Economic/employment impact statements.*—Prohibits preparation of economic or employment impact analyses of an acquisition program for which all RDT&E has not been completed.

SEC. 8051. *Obligations in anticipation of appropriations.*—Ratifies obligations incurred in anticipation of appropriations and authority in the appropriations act, if they are otherwise in accordance with the provisions of the act.

SEC. 8052. *Unsolicited proposals/consulting.*—Prohibits funding for contracts for studies, analyses, or consulting services entered into without competition on the basis of an unsolicited proposal, with certain exceptions.

SEC. 8053. *Demilitarization of firearms.*—Prohibits use of funds to demilitarize or dispose of more than 310,784 unserviceable M-1 Garand rifles and M-1 carbines.

SEC. 8054. *Selective reenlistment bonus.*—Prohibits payment of more than 50 percent of a selective reenlistment bonus in a lump sum.

SEC. 8055. *Supervisor's grade assignment.*—Denies DOD authority to base grade structure for supervisors on the number of employees supervised.

SEC. 8056. *CHAMPUS deductibles.*—Raises CHAMPUS deductibles from \$50 per individual and \$100 per family to \$150 per individual and \$300 per family. Also gives the Secretary of Defense authority to place certain restrictions on use of military hospitals (other than for emergencies) for persons who choose not to enroll in certain health care plans. Enlisted members in grades E-1 through E-4 are exempt from provisions of this section. Amends House provision to allow increased coinsurance payments for failure to enroll in a health care plan.

SEC. 8057. *EMPRESS.*—Agrees with House language repeating a provision preventing operation of the electromagnetic pulse radiation environment simulator for ships [EMPRESS] in the Chesapeake Bay area without certain certifications by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8058. *Chiropractic care demonstration project.*—Sets \$4,000,000 ceiling on funds available for chiropractic care demonstration project.

SEC. 8059. *CHAMPUS peer review organization program.*—Provides for peer review of health services under CHAMPUS.

SEC. 8060. *Pay raise absorption.*—Allows absorption of funds for military and civilian pay raises, if necessary.

SEC. 8061. *Wound research, cats.*—Prohibits funding for a project involving the use of cats for brain missile wound research.

SEC. 8062. *Trauma research, dogs.*—Prohibits funding for a project on bone trauma research until certain conditions have been met.

SEC. 8063. *Base closure/realignment plan.*—Requires the Secretary of Defense to provide a 5-year review of the force structure,

funding, and economic consequences expected from any base closure plan submitted to Congress after enactment of the act.

SEC. 8064. *Mentor-Protege Program*.—Bill language regarding the eligibility of certain business enterprises to be proteges under the Pilot Mentor-Protege Program. The provision makes explicit the eligibility of business enterprises owned by an Indian tribe, an Alaska native corporation, or a native Hawaiian organization. It also provides eligibility for business entities having within their work force specified percentages of severely disabled individuals who have been integrated into the organization's overall work force through the use of rehabilitative engineering.

SEC. 8065. *Fort Bragg mental health demonstration project*.—Caps at \$14,000,000 funds available for the Fort Bragg mental health demonstration project.

SEC. 8066. *Andersen Air Base Guam*.—Repeats language from last year directing that none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used to produce more than two-thirds of the liquid gas requirements in-house at Andersen Air Force Base on Guam. At least one-third of Andersen Air Force Base's liquid gas requirements shall be met by acquiring liquid gas from commercial sources on Guam.

SEC. 8067. *Reserve/Guard force structure*.—Replaces House provision. Recommended amendment prohibits reducing the end strength of the National Guard and Reserve Components below the levels funded in this act or reducing the force structure allowance for the Army National Guard and Army Reserve below 450,000 and 310,000 respectively. The Committee intends that no reductions be made to active component military personnel or operation and maintenance appropriations to sustain the force structure allowance for the National Guard and Reserve components. Any necessary offsetting reductions may only be derived from procurement and research, development, test and evaluation appropriations provided in this act. The Committee further directs that any adjustments in the fiscal year 1993 amended budget submission to maintain National Guard and Reserve component force structure above the level assumed in the fiscal year 1992-93 budget request may only be offset by reductions to procurement and research, development, test and evaluation budget requests.

SEC. 8068. *Military leave*.—Allows Reserves/Guard to use military leave when performing activities to save life or property.

SEC. 8069. *A-76 studies*.—Prohibits funding for A-76 cost studies if the study being performed is over 2 years in process for a single activity, or 4 years for a multifunction activity.

SEC. 8070. *Science and engineering graduate fellowships*.—Ear-marks \$10,000,000 for the National Defense Science and Engineering Graduate Fellowships Program. Not less than 50 percent of the funds would come from the University Research Initiatives Program in the "Defense agencies RDT&E" account and the balance would come from all defense research sciences funds in the RDT&E title (Title IV).

SEC. 8071. *American Forces Information Service*.—Prohibits AFIS from engaging in national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8072. *National defense stockpile transaction fund strategic materials research grants.*—Prohibits the use of funds in the stockpile transaction fund to finance grants or contracts for research regarding development or production of advanced strategic and critical materials. Since the Transaction fund is not subject to annual appropriations, such use constitutes back door spending, which the Committee adamantly opposes. Any materials research activities should be subject to annual actions and oversight by the Appropriations Committees.

SEC. 8073. *Ada computer program language.*—Requires the Department, where cost-effective, to use Ada programming language after June 1, 1991, unless specifically exempted by an official designated by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8074. *Wage rates for civilian health care occupations.*—Gives the Secretary of Defense the same authority to adjust wage rates for certain civilian health care providers as is authorized for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs. Amends to correct cite from Title 38.

SEC. 8075. *Psychologists prescribing drugs.*—Allows training of psychologists to prescribe drugs in accordance with recommendations of Army Surgeon General's blue ribbon panel. Training is to be provided at Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

SEC. 8076. *Installation of equipment.*—Recommends inclusion of a new general provision, as requested in the President's budget, which allows the Defense Department to obligate procurement funds for the installation of equipment after the obligational authority has expired. The Committee reiterates its view that the Defense Department needs to propose a better mechanism for the procurement and installation of equipment to be completed within the 3-year obligation limitation of procurement funds.

SEC. 8077. *Rescissions.*—Rescinds funds in procurement and RDT&E accounts.

SEC. 8078. *F-15E aircraft.*—The Committee recommends a general provision which directs that the Defense Department obligate funds made available through the sale of 24 F-15 aircraft to Saudi Arabia to purchase 12 new production F-15E aircraft. The language stipulates that these aircraft shall be in addition to the 36 aircraft funded in the fiscal year 1991 Appropriations Act. The Committee includes this direction because of the apparent confusion within the Defense Department on the position of the Congress regarding use of funds available for the F-15E. In addition to the provision discussed here, the Committee has also included a transfer of \$722,200,000 under the "Air Force aircraft procurement" appropriation. This transfer increases funding for the F-15E program to provide for support equipment which the Defense Department has underfunded in this and future budgets. With the addition of this funding, the Committee cannot understand any reason why the Defense Department would not proceed immediately to comply with this provision.

SEC. 8079. *Civil Air Patrol.*—Directs that, of the funds made available in this act, not less than \$8,674,000 shall be available to the Civil Air Patrol, of which \$4,400,000 shall be available for operation and maintenance.

SEC. 8080. *WC-130 hurricane reconnaissance aircraft.*—Directs the DOD to continue to provide full budgetary and operational sup-

port for the WC-130 Weather Reconnaissance Squadron. In addition, DOD is to dedicate sufficient manpower and airframes to the WC-130 mission to support 1,600 hurricane reconnaissance flight hours and sufficient additional hours for aircrew proficiency training, to generate up to five sorties a day, and to cover the Atlantic, Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and Hawaii in accordance with the national hurricane operations plan.

The Committee expects that the Air Force Reserve squadron will support the full complement of aircraft needed for the hurricane mission and that funds will be added to the budget request to make up for the shortfall.

Last, the Committee directs that nothing be done to disestablish or diminish the operational activity or mission effectiveness of the WC-130 Weather Reconnaissance Squadron.

SEC. 8081. *Defense business operations fund.*—Permits this fund to provide credits for Army and Air Force operation and maintenance customers purchasing depot level repairables. This will ease transition to new financing methods that have been adopted for these types of purchases.

SEC. 8082. *Workshops for the blind and handicapped.*—Grants authority for businesses providing supplies and services to the Department of Defense to credit amounts subcontracted to qualified nonprofit agencies for the blind or other severely handicapped as part of their subcontracting goal pursuant to section 8(d) of the Small Business Act.

SEC. 8083. *CIA facilities consolidation.*—Provides \$32,900,000 to be used to acquire land and for such other associated expenditures and actions to implement the plan developed by the Central Intelligence Agency to consolidate its facilities into permanent compounds. The Committee has reviewed CIA plans to consolidate 21 Agency facilities into two compounds located in West Virginia and Virginia, and wishes action to commence on this program as soon as prudently possible after enactment.

In accordance with the guidelines contained in the Senate Intelligence Committee report on this matter, the Committee directs that no more than \$27,000,000 of the funds be available, and requires a prior approval for release of the remaining funds should the CIA propose to contract in excess of that amount. The Committee is impressed with the thoroughness of the work done by the CIA in attempting to finally alleviate seriously overcrowded conditions—often in substandard working space—and a fragmented working environment for a substantial portion of the Agency's employees. It believes the time is overdue to implement a long-term plan to establish the direction of the intelligence community's facilities during the next century. The Committee notes that Congress has encouraged the Agency to develop such a plan, and has withheld GSA rents for the past 3 years pending a final recommendation on this matter.

While the Committee also is pleased with the prospect, as reported by the Agency, for savings of well over \$500,000,000 dollars through early in the next century on property costs, projected as a result of implementing its consolidation plan, it is convinced that the central value in it is the enhanced efficiency, focus, and operational stability that will be available to allow the intelligence

community to do a better job in its vital missions on a long-term basis.

The Committee is pleased that the Agency has responded to the need for such a plan over the last year of work and commends the outgoing Director of Central Intelligence, Judge Webster, for recognizing the importance of proceeding with this plan at this time, when economic conditions should enable the Agency to secure the most advantageous acquisition of the necessary properties and services at least cost to the taxpayer.

At the same time, the Committee wishes to oversee this project carefully, and ensure that the plan is implemented in the most efficient, careful way possible. Consequently, the Committee: (a) directs that the CIA consult with the General Services Administration on the proposed consolidation and relocation of space the CIA currently occupies in the National Capital region. This consultation is intended to assure that, insofar as it is practicable, the acquisition of land for any new facilities is most advantageous to the Government, that there is compliance with zoning, building codes, and local land use planning regulations, and that the interests of the employees will be considered. The CIA and GSA are directed to keep the Committee informed on the extent and results of this consultation; (b) encourages competitive bidding procedures within the respective geographic sites for the acquisition of property and services for CIA space consolidation plans; and (c) directs that the CIA give prior notification to the Committee of its intent to enter into a contract for the purchase of property or for the acquisition of services in excess of \$500,000 in any given year. In general, the Committee wishes to be consulted in advance of any major milestone or change in the plan.

SEC. 8084. *Practicing physicians.*—Allows special medical pay for flag or general officers who are full-time practicing physicians.

SEC. 8085. *CHAMPUS copayment waiver.*—Allows physicians to waive patient copayments for medical services provided to dependents of active duty personnel from August 2, 1990, until return of troops from Persian Gulf area, provided cost to Government does not increase. Recommended amendments would allow all health care providers (not just physicians) to waive copayments and clarify that provision applies until Operation Desert Shield/Desert is terminated.

SEC. 8086. *Uniformed services treatment facilities.*—Sets a dollar limit on funding for the uniformed services treatment facilities in fiscal year 1992.

SEC. 8087. *LEASAT.*—Permits Navy to provide notice that it will exercise options under the LEASAT program for the next fiscal year.

SEC. 8088. *Common airborne instrumentation systems.*—New provision governing funds associated with development of airborne instrumentation systems for test and evaluation purposes.

SEC. 8089. *Intelligence transfer.*—Recommends the inclusion of a new general provision, as requested and as recommended by the House, which mandates that expenditures related to non-DOD classified activities funded by this act shall no longer be counted as expenditures upon transfer from DOD to the relevant agency. In-

stead, expenditures shall be recorded when the relevant agency spends the funds.

SEC. 8090. *V-22 statutory funds transfer.*—Disagrees with House language governing funds for the V-22A tilt-rotor aircraft program. The Committee amends the House provision to insert the statutory language contained in the budget request. The alternative language transfers \$165,000,000 from unobligated, current fiscal year Navy aircraft procurement funds to the fiscal year 1992 RDT&E account for V-22A activities.

SEC. 8091. *CHAMPUS coordination of benefits.*—Allows receipts from collections from third party payers to remain with the local military hospital and to be over and above the facility's direct budget amount.

SEC. 8092. *SCN fund transfer.*—Transfers funding into SCN accounts. Included in this section, the Committee recommends \$59,000,000 to be merged with available fiscal year 1990 appropriations for one icebreaking vessel for the Coast Guard. During consideration of the fiscal year 1990 supplemental appropriations request for Operation Just Cause and aid to Panama and Nicaragua, the Committee agreed to reduce available funding for the icebreaker, pending completion of a joint Navy/Coast Guard program review. These additional funds meet the requirement identified in that report. The Committee expects the Navy and the Coast Guard to proceed expeditiously to commence construction of this vessel. The Secretary of the Navy shall provide the Committee with the acquisition plan and construction schedule for the vessel not later than December 15, 1991. The Committee considers this program to be an item of special interest and foresees no need for further delay in procurement of this vessel.

SEC. 8093. *Strategic target system [STARS] environmental impact statement.*—Recommends a new general provision restricting the use of certain funds until a formal environmental impact statement is completed for the strategic target system program to launch rockets from the Navy's Pacific Missile Range Facility, Barking Sands, Kauai, HI.

SEC. 8094. *Special access program oversight.*—In the interest of security, and the protection of particularly sensitive technologies, Congress has permitted DOD very circumscribed oversight. The number of members and staff accessed to these programs has been limited, and the reporting system is separate from normal Department reporting. Indeed, some programs had never been reported to Congress until this year and many had been severely limited in their reporting. Testifying before the Defense Subcommittee on April 23, 1991, the Assistant Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Counterintelligence and Security) implied that the Administration might desire to continue to sequester some programs from oversight completely. The Committee does not accept this proposition and has included language in the bill and the classified annex prohibiting the funding of any special access program [SAP] that has not been reported to the Congress. The Committee cautions the administration that it will move to terminate any program which the administration continues to fund, or to begin funding, that has not been presented to the Congress for appropriate oversight, and it will be to no avail to call such a program by some designation

other than special access in order to circumvent the intent of this section.

The Committee last year agreed to language directing that the DOD report to the Congress on all SAP's, without exception, including operational and intelligence SAP's, as well as acquisition SAP's. While the Department has made an effort to comply in the area of operational SAP's, the initial report on the details of those programs is inadequate, so much so that it is difficult for the Committee to fully understand the scope and nature of the programs being reported without additional briefings. The Committee expects the reporting to be more detailed and to include all relevant matters which would be reasonable for a full understanding of the importance and nature of the programs being provided special security protection. If such adequacy in detail is not forthcoming in the context of the submission of the fiscal year 1993 budget, the Committee will consider terminating those programs for which inadequate reporting is made.

The Committee supports the initiative of the Senate Armed Services Committee in the fiscal year 1992 authorization measure to reform the management of SAP's and has included the Senate-passed legislation on this subject in this bill to reinforce to the executive branch the importance it attaches to this matter.

SEC. 8095. *Catchment area demonstration sites.*—Disagrees with House provision that limits catchment area management [CAM] demonstration sites to 15. Recommended amendments limit CAM sites only to those approved by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs in advance and removes restriction on use of CAM attributes.

SEC. 8096. *Environmental restoration.*—New provision appropriates \$885,000,000 for environmental cleanup. The Committee is disturbed that a significant portion of the funds that have been provided for the "Environmental restoration, defense" appropriation account has gone for studies and that little actual cleaning up of the environment has occurred. The Committee recommendation will begin to address this problem. Further, the Committee has made the funds available for 3 years to allow the Defense Department to proceed appropriately in responding to this initiative.

SEC. 8097. *CHAMPUS disabled care.*—Agrees with House provision which allows former members of the uniformed services who are 100 percent disabled—and who, except for their disability would be eligible for CHAMPUS coverage—to be covered by CHAMPUS. Appropriates \$20,000,000. Recommended amendment is a technical correction to the House language and does not change its intent.

SEC. 8098. *Air Force vehicles.*—Allows the Department of the Air Force to purchase vehicles.

SEC. 8099. *Burdensharing—Korea.*—Permits the Secretary of Defense to accept contributions from Korea to pay for local employees' salaries, supplies, and services. The Department must submit a quarterly report detailing what contributions were received in the preceding quarter.

SEC. 8100. *Coast Guard.*—This provision provides \$318,400,000 which shall be transferred to the U.S. Coast Guard immediately upon enactment of this bill. Of this amount, \$221,100,000 is provid-

ed for the Coast Guard's defense readiness activities including drug interdiction, \$77,300,000 shall be available for reserve training, and \$20,000,000 is provided for operation, maintenance, and manning of overseas *lōran-C* chains.

SEC. 8101. *Space-based wide area surveillance programs.*—Prohibits any Federal funds from being obligated or expended for research, development, test and evaluation for the space-based wide area surveillance projects or activities in six Air Force program elements and for the Navy's program addressing the same requirements. This provision is recommended due to the lack of Defense Department adherence to the restrictions in the report language accompanying the fiscal year 1990 Defense appropriations measure.

SEC. 8102. *Stock fund obligations.*—Amends House provision to limit obligations to 80 percent of expected stock fund sales (vice 90 percent in House bill), but allows more exemptions.

SEC. 8103. *Transfer of prior year funds to FEMA.*—Proposes a new general provision which transfers \$2,500,000 of funds previously appropriated for a classified program to the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA].

SEC. 8104. *B-1B electronic warfare systems.*—Disagrees with House recommendation to delete last year's provision governing funds to fix the B-1B bomber's ALQ-161A CORE electronic warfare system and preventing use of any funds for RDT&E, installation, integration, or procurement of an advanced radar warning receiver for the aircraft. The Committee recommends language which amends the fiscal year 1991 provision to reinsert just the prohibition on use of any funds for radar warning receiver work.

SEC. 8105. *Mount Pinatubo Claims.*—Recommends a new provision which appropriates \$289,000,000 for payment of claims to U.S. civilian and military personnel for payment of claims for damages caused by the volcanic eruption of Mount Pinatubo.

SEC. 8106. *University audits.*—Agrees with House language to prevent grants or contracts for fiscal year 1992 funds, or to terminate any ongoing agreement, to any institution of higher learning unless certain auditing and financial disclosure requirements are met.

SEC. 8107. *FFRDC Board of Directors.*—Amends House language preventing payment of fiscal year 1992 defense funds to any FFRDC if it has a member of its Board who also serves on the Board of a defense contractor. The amendment adds a proviso setting ceilings on the total amount of funds defense FFRDC's can receive next fiscal year.

SEC. 8108. *Transportation of chemical weapons.*—Prohibits the expenditure of funds by the Department of Defense to transport any additional chemical weapons to Johnston Atoll after the completion of the European retrograde program. The general provision affirms assurances by the Secretary of Defense that Johnston Atoll would not become a repository for the destruction of all U.S. chemical weapons. Waivers have been included in this provision which will allow the transportation of chemical weapons discovered in the Pacific region and further grants the President waiver authority in time of war.

SEC. 8109. *Studies of the transportation of chemical weapons.*—Prohibits funding for preparation of studies to determine the feasi-

bility of removal and transportation of chemical weapons stored in the continental United States.

SEC. 8110. *Local hiring in noncontiguous States.*—Requires contractors to use local residents for DOD contracts in noncontiguous States if the unemployment rate is higher than the national average.

SEC. 8111. *Alcoholic beverages.*—Requires DOD activities to procure alcoholic beverages locally in noncontiguous States.

SEC. 8112. *Incentive payments under Indian Financing Act.*—Makes \$8,000,000 available for incentive payments authorized under the Indian Financing Act and amends certain provisions of the act entitled "An Act to Prescribe Penalties For Certain Acts of Violence or Intimidation, and For Other Purposes", to inform and clarify the inherent powers of Indian tribes to exercise criminal jurisdiction over all Indians.

SEC. 8113. *Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA] cooperative ventures.*—Recommends a new general provision restricting the use of Defense Department funds for cooperative ventures to DARPA and to prevent expansion of this program to the armed services.

SEC. 8114. *Radiation Exposure Compensation Act.*—Amends House provision to direct transfer of \$15,000,000 and deletes House language prohibiting payment of attorneys' fees; guidelines for paying attorneys were established in the original act.

SEC. 8115. *Diesel submarine construction.*—Prohibits the Department of Defense from precluding private shipyards in the United States from bidding for the construction of diesel-powered submarines for sale to U.S. allies. The Committee has repeatedly expressed its concern over the vitality and future prospects for the U.S. shipbuilding industrial base. The Department's 6-year budget plan presents a steady decline in new ship construction for the Navy. One option to preserve the U.S. industrial base would be to allow U.S. shipyards to bid for conventional submarine work. This opportunity is especially critical in cases where the potential purchaser is an ally of the United States and may, in fact, be using U.S. military aid to pay for the construction of such vessels.

The Committee does not concur with the position recently taken by the Secretary of the Navy in blocking the construction of submarines for sale to Egypt. At a time when the U.S. budget foresees constructing a limited number of submarines each year, the continued prohibition on constructing conventional submarines for sale to U.S. allies no longer serves the national interest.

SEC. 8116. *Congressional defense committees.*—Defines the term "congressional defense committees."

SEC. 8117. *Training at Kahoolawe Island.*—Prohibits bombing, gunnery training, or similar munitions delivery training on Kahoolawe Island, HI.

SEC. 8118. *Allied cooperation enhancement studies.*—Provides funds for the study of potential allied cooperation in research, development, test and evaluation. The Committee believes that numerous opportunities exist to strengthen strategic cooperation between the United States and Israel and expects the Department of Defense to provide concrete recommendations, and a timetable for implementation, for initiatives across the full range of defense,

aerospace, antiterrorism, counternarcotics, environmental and critical technology activities. Further, as the defense budget declines and competition in the global marketplace increases, the United States must cultivate closer relationships with its allies in the development of new technologies that are both cost effective and add significantly to U.S. defense capabilities.

The Committee commends the exceptional effort made by the Deputy Under Secretary (International Programs) and the staff of the Assistant Deputy Under Secretary (Asia/Middle East/Southern Hemisphere) in carrying out the Committee mandated allied cooperation enhancement studies. The Committee believes these studies break new ground in the area of international defense cooperation and provide opportunities for the United States to realize significant cost savings and enhanced readiness in the research, development, and procurement of new weapons systems with a major non-NATO ally [MNNA].

The Committee is renewing its study provision from last year (section 8115) in the expectation that the far-ranging contacts between the Department of Defense and foreign industries will continue. The Committee is including two new subsections to the list of areas of possible foreign technological cooperation in the hope that they will be the catalyst for future evaluation and development. These areas include: (1) the applications of environmental technologies and manufacturing capabilities to include the full range of energy storage, energy conversion and renewable energy technologies as well as those connected with environmental protection, management, restoration, maintenance and hazardous waste disposal and remediation; and (2) the applications of critical technologies and manufacturing capabilities as defined by the Department of Defense's critical technologies plan.

The Committee believes that these two subject categories, broadly construed, have great potential for foreign collaboration and along with the other study areas should be aggressively pursued.

Finally, the Committee supports efforts by the Senate Armed Services Committee to encourage the Department of Defense to do more to capitalize on the technological and manufacturing know-how of our NATO and major non-NATO allies. The Committee believes that programs which provide incentives and promote cooperative weapons development through industrial matchmaking, feasibility studies, market analyses, data exchange, technological assessments, small-scale testing and research, conferences and other activities will do much to catalyze the creation of transnational joint ventures and teaming arrangements.

SEC. 8119. *Army Corps of Engineers.*—Prohibits obligating funds to implement the Army Corps of Engineers reorganization study until such reorganization is authorized by law.

SEC. 8120. *Competition of depot maintenance and repair.*—Continues authorities of the Defense Department to compete acquisition of defense-related articles between defense depot maintenance activities and private firms.

SEC. 8121. *Defense business operations fund.*—Establishes the defense business operations fund and delineates restrictions on the use of funds for purchasing capital equipment and improvements from that fund.

SEC. 8122. *Overseas workload program.*—Allows firms of any member nation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO], or of any major non-NATO ally, to bid on any contract for the maintenance, repair, or overhaul of equipment of the Department of Defense. For purposes of this provision, Israel is to be considered in the European theater.

SEC. 8123. *Classified annex and report.*—This section provides that the amounts specified for the specific projects, programs, or activities that are to be carried out with funds appropriated by this act and that are set forth in the classified annex shall have the force and effect of law as if enacted into law. The intent and effect of this provision is to incorporate the annex into the enacted statute. The specific language used is well established and has been used on dozens of occasions to provide legally binding status, incorporating by reference matter outside of an unclassified statutory bill. Any limitation, requirement, or condition contained in the classified annex pertaining to any project, program, or activity thereby has the force and effect of law by virtue of this provision. The clear purpose and intent of the provision is to eliminate any ambiguity or uncertainty as to the binding legal effect of the amounts specified and language of the classified annex to this act, which this report accompanies.

This act appropriates funds and specifies certain limitations, requirements, and conditions on those funds for the National Foreign Intelligence Program [NFIP], related intelligence activities in other agencies, including tactical intelligence and related programs [TIARA] in DOD and special access programs in DOD. The total of all these budgets appropriated by the legislation is very substantial.

Until fiscal year 1991, the Committee prepared a classified annex which was intended to provide binding direction on the activities of the executive branch for all these programs, as well as prescribing specific dollar amounts for them. Legally, the text of the classified annex was not incorporated into the underlying act, but the practice of the executive branch was to comply with the directives and recommendations of the annex. However, recently, the executive branch has taken the position that the classified annex is simply a report like any other report issued by the committees of the Congress to accompany legislation enacted by the Congress, rather than law, and that such reports are merely advisory in nature. Consequently, a number of very important decisions included in the classified reports to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for both fiscal years 1990 and 1991 were either ignored or challenged by the executive branch, presumably on the grounds that they were not legally bound to comply with them.

Consequently, both the Defense Appropriations and authorization Committees took the initiative to include an identical provision in the fiscal year 1991 appropriations (Sec. 8111) and authorizations laws, giving the classified annexes accompanying those acts the status of law. In addition, the Committee, in fiscal year 1992, as in fiscal year 1991, has prepared a comprehensive and detailed classified report to clarify the meaning of the provisions of the annex and to provide additional guidance which the Committee expects the executive branch to regard as authoritative and to follow

in good faith as it should in respect to congressional reports accompanying all legislation.

It should be noted that the administration expressed its opposition to the inclusion of this provision in the fiscal year 1991 act. Since the provision was being included for the first time in that act, the Committee included, in section 114 of the annex the following: "The Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence shall provide reports to the Appropriations, Armed Services, and Intelligence Committees outlining their positions on the practice of incorporating the classified annexes into annual authorization and appropriations acts, including possible legal, technical, public policy or other issues which could have an impact on the effective execution of the intelligence and defense functions of the U.S. Government." No such reports were provided to the Committees, and the Committee has no reason to believe that this practice has resulted, or will result, in any deleterious effects on the national security of the United States. On the contrary, the Committee believes there are very important public policy and constitutional issues which dictate the continuation of the practice established last year.

The central problem in the situation is that, due to the classified nature of the activities being appropriated and directed, there has simply not been any legislative foundation that the classified reports previously accompanied. For reasons of national security, the funding is concealed in general DOD accounts in the underlying DOD appropriations measure, and contains no effective guidance for the departments and agencies concerned. The only vehicle available had been the classified report itself, which the Congress intended to be binding and which the executive branch chose to regard as a standard committee report which it could comply with or ignore as it saw fit. The Committee cannot accept any ambiguity or uncertainty over the binding effect of its decisions affecting such large sums of money and activities so vital and, in some cases, controversial. There are fundamental constitutional, and institutional questions at stake in this matter—in particular, will the checks and balances as they now are in place between the two branches have equal relevance and force in relation to the highly classified agencies, budgets, and programs that have grown in the last several decades? The decisions reached after long deliberation by our Committee on these programs are sometimes at variance with the desires of the executive branch, sometimes controversial, and have in a number of recent important situations become matters of dispute between the two branches. To allow the executive branch discretion to comply or not with the provisions of the annex would, in effect, be assenting to a de facto line-item veto authority on its part over the entirety of the intelligence programs and special access programs engaged in by the United States, a sweeping abdication of authority of the Congress in areas which are central and critical to the national security of the United States.

Thus, the Committee has included this provision in order to remove any ambiguity as to the legally binding nature of the provisions of the classified annex. While the classified annex cannot be debated in open session, it will be passed concurrently as an integral part of the Defense Appropriations Act and will be presented

together with the unclassified portion of the bill to the President. They will be enacted, vetoed, or fail of enactment as one piece of legislation. The Committee expects the executive branch to comply with the annex as it would any enacted law.

SEC. 8124. *Flexible computer integrated manufacturing systems programs.*—Recommends new provision governing the use of funds appropriated for flexible computer integrated manufacturing systems programs. Further elaboration can be found under RDT&E, Defense agencies.

SEC. 8125. *Base closures property conveyance.*—Grants authority to the Secretary of Defense to convey all right, title, and interest of the United States to a State or eligible political subdivision of a military installation that has been closed under the base closure law. This provision will assist communities in their effort to recover from economic dislocation resulting from a base closure.

SEC. 8126. *Calista conveyance and relinquishment agreement.*—The Committee has included a new general provision that provides authority for the conveyance of certain lands to the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 8127. *Ball and roller bearings.*—This section requires the Department of Defense [DOD] to extend for at least 1 additional year a 1988 Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation [DFAR] restricting the purchase of bearings for defense application to North American sources. The Pentagon adopted this DFAR in an effort to save the domestic ball and roller bearing industry from disappearing as a result of intense foreign competition. The Joint Logistic Commander [JLC] issued a landmark report in June 1986 which concluded that the bearing industry is "critical to national security". The report also found that domestic industry is on a "precipice ready to collapse" and "unless a Government procurement regulation requires the purchase of domestically manufactured bearings for all military applications," the domestic industry will disappear. To remedy this problem, the report recommended that DOD implement a domestic procurement requirement for "at least 5 years".

In 1988, DOD adopted an abbreviated 3 year FAR with an optional 2 year extension designed to help save the bearing industry. Since the FAR's adoption, DOD's inspector general [IG] has determined that the Pentagon has failed to implement or enforce the FAR effectively. According to a January 1991 inspector general audit report, DOD did not include a domestic source clause, as the FAR required, in 68 percent of the Pentagon contracts it examined. Even when DOD did include the required clause, the report found that DOD never attempted to verify that contractors were complying.

In light of DOD's original determination that at least a 5-year period was necessary for the FAR and further, considering that DOD has not properly implemented the FAR for the first 3 years, the Committee believes it essential for the FAR to be extended for the original 5-year period. The Committee directs the Pentagon to extend the FAR for at least 1 additional year and strongly urges DOD to extend the FAR for the full term as proposed in the JLC study.

SEC. 8128. *U.S.S. Kennedy.*—The Committee has included a provision to require that funds already enacted for the service life exten-

sion program for the U.S.S. *Kennedy* at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard [PNSY] be obligated immediately for the complex overhaul of the U.S.S. *Kennedy* at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. Because the Committee believes that the U.S.S. *Kennedy* will be required to serve in the fleet until at least 2010, the Committee concludes that the upcoming complex overhaul should include replacement of all components necessary for the *Kennedy* to maintain its normal operational schedule until 2010. The Committee notes that this is the most sensible maintenance plan for the U.S.S. *Kennedy* given that PNSY is the only facility currently capable of performing major work on non-nuclear aircraft carriers. Advance procurement, including replacement engines, must begin immediately so that the complex overhaul can begin in fiscal year 1993 and the *Kennedy* can be returned to the fleet on schedule in 1995.

SEC. 8129. Permits privately funded abortions for military personnel and their dependents in military hospitals outside the United States.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992

[Amounts in dollars]

Item (1)	1991 appropriation (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Committee recom- mendation (5)	1991 appropriation (6)	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
						Budget estimate (7)	House allowance (8)
TITLE I							
MILITARY PERSONNEL							
Military Personnel, Army.....	23,227,226,000	24,226,100,000	24,526,100,000	24,136,000,000	+208,774,000	-90,100,000	-390,100,000
Military Personnel, Navy.....	19,111,067,000	19,597,700,000	19,577,700,000	19,603,025,000	+491,958,000	+5,325,000	+25,325,000
Military Personnel, Marine Corps.....	5,911,602,000	6,066,800,000	6,086,800,000	6,055,360,000	+143,758,000	-11,440,000	-31,440,000
Military Personnel, Air Force.....	19,786,172,000	18,905,500,000	18,905,500,000	18,838,800,000	-947,372,000	-66,700,000	-66,700,000
Reserve Personnel, Army.....	2,363,300,000	2,192,800,000	2,320,800,000	2,298,800,000	-64,500,000	+106,000,000	-22,000,000
Reserve Personnel, Navy.....	1,645,300,000	1,648,600,000	1,718,600,000	1,710,600,000	+65,000,000	+62,000,000	-8,000,000
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps.....	336,400,000	326,900,000	354,900,000	342,400,000	+6,000,000	+15,500,000	-12,500,000
Reserve Personnel, Air Force.....	686,800,000	705,300,000	721,500,000	715,100,000	+28,300,000	+9,800,000	-6,400,000
National Guard Personnel, Army.....	3,379,500,000	3,201,700,000	3,395,700,000	3,320,400,000	-59,100,000	+118,700,000	-75,300,000
National Guard Personnel, Air Force.....	1,098,400,000	1,145,500,000	1,145,500,000	1,145,500,000	+47,100,000	---	---
Total, title I, Military Personnel: New budget (obligational) authority.....	78,245,467,000	78,016,900,000	78,753,100,000	78,165,985,000	-79,482,000	+149,085,000	-587,115,000
TITLE II							
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE							
Operation and Maintenance, Army.....	21,571,694,000	21,886,800,000	18,362,945,000	20,913,805,000	-657,889,000	-972,995,000	+2,550,860,000
Operation and Maintenance, Navy.....	23,308,647,000	23,934,200,000	21,394,932,000	23,012,390,000	-296,257,000	-921,810,000	+1,617,458,000
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps.....	1,892,200,000	1,894,600,000	2,082,500,000	2,109,665,000	+217,465,000	+215,065,000	+27,165,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force.....	20,092,735,000	20,342,900,000	17,660,213,000	19,242,014,000	-850,721,000	-1,100,886,000	+1,581,801,000
Operation and Maintenance, Defense Agencies.....	8,498,957,000	8,794,800,000	18,599,037,000	8,635,768,000	-136,811,000	-159,032,000	-9,963,269,000
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve.....	909,100,000	937,200,000	995,600,000	962,200,000	+53,100,000	+25,000,000	-33,400,000
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve.....	998,000,000	816,100,000	825,500,000	840,600,000	-157,400,000	+24,500,000	+15,100,000
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve.....	84,800,000	75,900,000	85,900,000	81,700,000	-3,100,000	+5,800,000	-4,200,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve.....	1,065,900,000	1,075,400,000	1,091,200,000	1,077,000,000	+11,100,000	+1,600,000	-14,200,000
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard.....	1,980,400,000	2,080,700,000	2,165,600,000	2,125,800,000	+145,400,000	+45,100,000	-39,800,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard.....	2,247,200,000	2,287,800,000	2,275,700,000	2,276,300,000	+29,100,000	-11,500,000	+600,000
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army.....	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	---	---	---
Court of Military Appeals, Defense.....	5,400,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	+100,000	---	---
Environmental Restoration, Defense.....	1,062,527,000	1,252,900,000	2,152,900,000	1,183,900,000	+121,373,000	-69,000,000	-969,000,000
Humanitarian Assistance.....	15,000,000	13,000,000	15,000,000	13,000,000	-2,000,000	---	-2,000,000

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991 AND BUDGET
ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued**

[Amounts in dollars]

Item (1)	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)						
	1991 appropriation (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Committee recom- mendation (5)	1991 appropriation (6)	Budget estimate (7)	House allowance (8)
World University Games.....	---	---	3,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000	-2,000,000
Summer Olympics.....	---	---	---	2,000,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000
Real Property Maintenance, Defense.....	---	---	---	1,000,000,000	+1,000,000,000	+1,000,000,000	+1,000,000,000
Total, title II, Operation and Maintenance: New budget (obligational) authority.....	83,737,560,000	85,402,800,000	87,720,527,000	83,487,642,000	-249,918,000	-1,915,158,000	-4,232,885,000
TITLE III							
PROCUREMENT							
Aircraft Procurement, Army.....	1,096,182,000	1,667,700,000	1,730,787,000	1,640,200,000	+544,018,000	-27,500,000	-90,587,000
Missile Procurement, Army.....	2,218,422,000	1,035,800,000	1,109,595,000	1,009,456,000	-1,208,966,000	-26,344,000	-100,139,000
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army.....	2,172,021,000	839,100,000	1,084,813,000	1,003,096,000	-1,168,925,000	+163,996,000	-81,717,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Army.....	1,367,569,000	1,249,800,000	1,364,859,000	1,325,421,000	-42,128,000	+75,821,000	-39,438,000
Other Procurement, Army.....	2,453,057,000	3,163,800,000	3,021,435,000	3,013,798,000	+560,741,000	-150,002,000	-7,637,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy.....	7,810,452,000	7,966,400,000	7,683,633,000	7,025,920,000	-764,532,000	-940,480,000	-657,713,000
Weapons Procurement, Navy.....	5,825,171,000	4,581,300,000	4,726,795,000	4,611,848,000	-1,213,323,000	+30,548,000	-114,947,000
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy.....	10,150,804,000	8,493,200,000	10,595,704,000	7,725,382,000	-2,435,422,000	-767,818,000	-2,870,322,000
Other Procurement, Navy.....	5,627,160,000	6,471,200,000	6,574,568,000	6,306,544,000	+679,384,000	-164,656,000	-268,024,000
Procurement, Marine Corps.....	719,141,000	1,039,400,000	1,043,218,000	1,100,570,000	+381,429,000	+61,170,000	+57,352,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force.....	9,541,455,000	11,115,500,000	7,444,121,000	10,349,396,000	+807,941,000	-766,104,000	+2,905,275,000
Missile Procurement, Air Force.....	5,813,532,000	5,599,800,000	5,243,841,000	5,332,671,000	-480,861,000	-267,129,000	-88,830,000
Other Procurement, Air Force.....	7,503,356,000	8,058,100,000	8,001,524,000	7,859,296,000	+355,940,000	-198,804,000	-142,228,000
National Guard and Reserve Equipment.....	2,463,700,000	---	1,292,500,000	667,300,000	+1,796,400,000	+667,300,000	-625,200,000
Procurement, Defense Agencies.....	2,354,646,000	2,089,600,000	2,708,446,000	2,087,400,000	-267,446,000	-2,200,000	-621,046,000
Defense Production Act Purchases.....	50,000,000	---	25,000,000	---	-50,000,000	---	-25,000,000
Procurement of Sealift and Positioning Equipment, Defense.....	---	---	995,000,000	2,000,000,000	+2,000,000,000	+2,000,000,000	+1,005,000,000
Total, title III, Procurement: New budget (obligational) authority.....	67,176,648,000	63,370,700,000	64,645,839,000	63,058,298,000	-4,118,350,000	-312,402,000	-1,587,541,000

TITLE IV

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army.....	5,607,379,000	6,307,300,000	6,241,621,000	6,280,361,000	+672,982,000	-26,939,000	+38,740,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy.....	9,037,684,000	7,342,633,000	7,464,910,000	7,666,142,000	-1,371,542,000	+323,509,000	+201,232,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force.....	11,961,310,000	15,032,600,000	14,263,941,000	14,123,675,000	+2,162,365,000	-908,925,000	-160,266,000
Agencies.....	9,115,699,000	10,238,500,000	8,979,141,000	9,393,542,000	+277,843,000	-844,958,000	+414,401,000
Developmental Test and Evaluation, Defense.....	237,720,000	286,300,000	221,300,000	315,764,000	-21,956,000	-70,536,000	-5,536,000
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense.....	15,000,000	14,200,000	14,200,000	14,200,000	-800,000	---	---
Total, title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation:	35,974,792,000	39,221,533,000	37,185,113,000	37,693,684,000	+1,718,892,000	-1,527,849,000	+508,571,000
New budget (obligational) authority.....	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

TITLE V

DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

Army Stock Fund Division.....	376,520,000	---	827,300,000	---	-376,520,000	---	-827,300,000
Navy Stock Fund.....	26,350,000	---	---	---	-26,350,000	---	---
Air Force Stock Fund Division.....	1,152,110,000	---	1,616,800,000	---	-1,152,110,000	---	-1,616,800,000
Defense Stock Fund.....	35,420,000	---	---	---	-35,420,000	---	---
Army Industrial fund.....	131,100,000	---	---	---	-131,100,000	---	---
Navy Industrial fund.....	238,700,000	---	---	---	-238,700,000	---	---
Defense Industrial fund.....	4,000,000	---	---	---	-4,000,000	---	---
Defense business operations fund.....	---	3,400,200,000	---	3,400,200,000	+3,400,200,000	---	+3,400,200,000
Total, title V, Revolving and Management Funds:	1,984,200,000	3,400,200,000	2,444,100,000	3,400,200,000	+1,416,000,000	---	+956,100,000
New budget (obligational) authority.....	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

TITLE VI

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense:							
Operation and maintenance.....	159,100,000	213,098,000	208,698,000	210,900,000	+51,800,000	-2,198,000	+2,202,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation.....	5,300,000	---	13,900,000	13,900,000	+8,600,000	+13,900,000	---
Procurement.....	115,100,000	261,702,000	229,202,000	250,000,000	+134,900,000	-11,702,000	+20,798,000
Retrograde.....	13,200,000	---	---	---	-13,200,000	---	---
Total, Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense.....	292,700,000	474,800,000	451,800,000	474,800,000	+182,100,000	---	+23,000,000
Drug Interdiction Defense.....	1,084,100,000	1,158,600,000	1,155,994,000	1,117,075,000	+32,975,000	-41,525,000	-38,919,000
Office of the Inspector General.....	99,500,000	116,200,000	121,900,000	116,200,000	+16,700,000	---	-5,700,000
Total, title VI, Other Department of Defense Programs: New budget (obligational) authority.....	1,476,300,000	1,749,600,000	1,729,694,000	1,708,075,000	+231,775,000	-41,525,000	-21,619,000

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991 AND BUDGET
ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued**

[Amounts in dollars]

Item (1)	1991 appropriation (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Committee recom- mendation (5)	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1991 appropriation (6)	Budget estimate (7)	House allowance (8)
TITLE VII							
RELATED AGENCIES							
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund.....	164,600,000	164,100,000	164,100,000	164,100,000	-500,000	---	---
Intelligence Community Staff.....	28,900,000	30,719,000	30,719,000	28,819,000	-81,000	-1,900,000	-1,900,000
Total, title VII, Related Agencies: New budget (obligational) authority.....	193,500,000	194,819,000	194,819,000	192,919,000	-581,000	-1,900,000	-1,900,000
TITLE VIII							
GENERAL PROVISIONS							
Transfer authority (Sec. 8006).....	(2,250,000,000)	(3,000,000,000)	(3,000,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(-1,250,000,000)	(-2,000,000,000)	(-2,000,000,000)
General reduction, contractor travel.....	-27,000,000	---	---	---	+27,000,000	---	---
Consultant Services (Sec. N 8046).....	-180,000,000	---	---	---	+180,000,000	---	---
Inapplicable inventory.....	-400,000,000	---	-300,000,000	---	+400,000,000	---	+300,000,000
Coast Guard (Sec. 8100).....	---	---	---	318,400,000	+318,400,000	+318,400,000	+318,400,000
ADP General Reduction (Sec. 8046).....	---	---	---	-202,000,000	-202,000,000	-202,000,000	-202,000,000
Environmental Cleanup (Sec. 8096).....	---	---	---	885,000,000	+885,000,000	+885,000,000	+885,000,000
Corporate Information Management Initiative (Sec. 8049)	1,000,000,000	---	---	716,729,000	-283,271,000	+716,729,000	+716,729,000
Philippine Claims (Sec. 8105).....	---	---	---	289,000,000	+289,000,000	+289,000,000	+289,000,000
Total, title VIII, General Provisions: New budget (obligational) authority.....	393,000,000	---	-300,000,000	2,007,129,000	+1,614,129,000	+2,007,129,000	+2,307,129,000